Waste Management Program Redesign

Final Report

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

February 7, 2005

Pub. No WA-590-05

Natural Resources Board

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

P. Scott Hassett, Secretary
William H. Smith, Deputy Secretary
Mary Schlaefer, Executive Assistant

Division of Air & Waste

Allen K. Shea, Administrator

Bureau of Waste Management

Suzanne Bangert, Director

Contributors to this report include:

Connie Antonuk - Department of Natural Resources
Suzanne Bangert - Department of Natural Resources
Michael Degen - Department of Natural Resources
Barbara Hennings - Department of Natural Resources
Dave Hildreth - Department of Natural Resources
Larry Lynch - Department of Natural Resources
Dennis Mack - Department of Natural Resources
John Melby - Department of Natural Resources
Cynthia Moore - Department of Natural Resources
Deb Pingel - Department of Natural Resources
Frank Schultz - Department of Natural Resources

For additional information, contact:
Suzanne Bangert (608) 266-0014

This report is available on-line at:

http://dnr.wi.gov/org/aw/wm/redesign/reports/reports.html

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

On March 19, 2004 Air & Waste Division Administrator, Al Shea, directed the Waste Management Program to analyze its operations and prepare a comprehensive set of recommendations to redesign the program. This redesign was prompted by a reduction in resources occurring over several budget cycles and changing internal and external business philosophies. The redesign effort was intended to build upon existing program and Department visions and goals.

A team of ten Waste Management Program managers and staff and one member of the Air & Waste Management Team was formed to complete this project. Members of this team represented many of the areas of technical expertise within the program, a variety of program job classifications, a mixture of central office and regional staff, and a wealth of experience within the Waste Management Program and the Department.

Key to the redesign work was a clear understanding of the issues involved with waste management, changing business needs, changing resources within and outside of the program, policy issues and improvement opportunities. A cornerstone of this effort involved stakeholder input including staff, external customers, and state legislators. The result of that input was an opportunities matrix that pointed to potential improvements in areas identified as: Customer Service, Innovation, Training, Management & Process, Environment, and Financial. Recommendations to achieve these improvements were developed based upon the Department's Waste Management program business functions.

Finally, these management systems recommendations were reviewed and sorted as being achievable in the near term (1 year), medium term (2-3 years), or long term (3-5 years).

Significant Recommendations of interest include:
- strengthen solid waste plan review oversight processes to improve consistency and timeliness of approvals, including consolidation of resources conducting plan review;
- continue plan review streamlining efforts;
- consolidate hazardous waste re-licensing efforts in locations of high activity;
- expand opportunities for Green Tier and Beyond Compliance activities including self-certification, self-audits, and self-reporting;
- support for the formation of a "Blue Ribbon Task Force" to evaluate the Recycling Program and develop policies to promote our vision of "Moving Toward Zero Waste";
- develop a comprehensive outreach program to educate and promote waste materials management goals;
- change the program's structure to improve internal operations and customer access;
- expand and improve the program's use of information technology to provide better service to internal and external customers, and
- adopt a new title for the program: Waste & Materials Management.

Implementation plans for all near term recommendations and priorities for them are included as part of this report. The opportunities and recommendations were also used to suggest changes to present program structure and operations. The Waste Management Program will direct implementation of these recommendations and measure performance of implementation and the success of the selected management systems over the next year. Following periodic evaluations the Waste Management Team will plan for the medium and long-term recommendations.

Overview

Introduction

In March, 2004, Al Shea, Administrator of the Air & Waste Division, unveiled the Waste Management Program Redesign to evaluate the program's work in these times of diminishing resources. Designed to maintain environmental standards and to protect public health while improving service, the Redesign effort will:

- Position the Waste Management Program to be more innovative, progressive and streamlined with the ability to more easily adapt to the changing needs of all our stakeholders

- Incorporate input from program staff and internal & external stakeholders

- Build on the areas of good work and innovation that exist within the program

- Optimize the use and distribution of staff resources to fit a downsized staff complement and

- Implement changes that will improve the program's credibility with stakeholders and decision-makers.

The Waste Management Program resources have been, and continue to be, significantly downsized. A considerable level of dissatisfaction exists with the program on the part of many stakeholders/decision-makers inside and outside of the program. This is adversely affecting the program's integrity. Unless the Waste Management Program takes proactive measures to address these issues, resources and credibility will continue to be diminished, thereby challenging our ability to protect public health and the environment.

With this in mind, the Waste Program Redesign Team was created. Membership is made up of Waste Management Program staff and managers and a representative from the Air & Waste Management Team.[1] Early work included the development of a Problem Statement, Goals and Criteria for Success.

Problem Statement and Goals

Problem: The Waste Management Program resources have been, and continue to be, downsized. Program service delivery, priorities and structure must reflect reduced resources.

Goals: Streamline functions in the program.

Consolidate/restructure the program, including management in response to reduced resources.

Be adaptable and able to respond quickly to future changes.

As the Redesign effort unfolded, the team created these criteria to guide its discussions and evaluate recommendations.

---

[1] Connie Antonuk, Sue Bangert, Mike Degen, Barb Hennings, Dave Hildreth, Larry Lynch, Dennis Mack, John Melby, Cynthia Moore, Deb Pingel, Frank Schultz and Susan Puntillo, facilitator.

Criteria for Success

- Streamline program functions and organization.

- Program is adaptive, progressive and collaborative.

- Work and initiatives ensure funding stability for the program.

- Work/initiatives direct resources to activities that effect the greatest public health and environmental benefit/impact.

- Addresses the concerns of stakeholders (NOTE: Stakeholders is defined as both internal and external, staff and management, private and public interests).

Waste Management Program Vision & Goals

It is important to revisit and affirm the program vision and goals and to make sure they reflect the present and future view of the program and support the goals of the redesign.

Vision: Moving Toward Zero Waste

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Waste Management Program works in partnership with others to protect public health and the environment through proper management of waste materials, recycling and mining activities. Our long-term vision, "Moving Toward Zero Waste", emphasizes materials and resource management by reducing waste generation, increasing recycling, and reducing the need for toxic substances through pollution prevention techniques. By adhering to this vision, we will move toward a society that uses fewer materials and toxic substances and that encourages and supports greater re-use and recycling of materials. We also will use this vision to direct our attention on some more immediate waste management problems and situations in the state. Maintaining and improving waste facilities and services will remain a critical component of an effective waste management system in both the near future and the longer-term future.

Goals

The current priority goals for "Moving Toward Zero Waste" are:

➢ Minimizing and preventing waste through recycling, waste minimization and pollution prevention;
➢ minimizing the potential for environmental impacts of landfills, and
➢ eliminating backyard burning and dumping.

Program staff will focus on these goals by working with stakeholders to emphasize waste reduction and waste diversion. These activities will include providing technical assistance and compliance assurance information to our customers. These efforts will foster integration, regulatory consistency and excellent customer service while "Moving Toward Zero Waste."

Stakeholder Input

The Waste Program Redesign Team made open communication and extensive stakeholder input to the process a high priority. Consequently, as a starting point for the Waste Program Redesign, stakeholder input was sought to better define the issues and concerns that need to be addressed, whether real or perceived. A communications plan was developed (Appendix A) and a web page placed on the DNR internet site to provide a repository for information to be accessed by both internal and external stakeholders as the process proceeded. Included on the site are meeting notes, input session summaries, documents prepared throughout the process, and reference documents that were utilized as informational sources. Stakeholders were encouraged throughout the process to feel free to ask questions or provide input at anytime. This provided a more open approach to stakeholder involvement.

The initial stages of stakeholder input included some one-on-one sessions with a few individuals talking directly to the Program Redesign Team. This provided a starting point of what issues our external partners have and what types of issues other programs encountered going through similar processes.[2]

Following those discussions, group sessions were scheduled with both internal and external partners. These sessions were held in late June and July of 2004. The external sessions were divided up into five sectors: 1) industrial, 2) private landfills and haulers, 3) environmental groups, 4) local government, and 5) consultants. A facilitator outside the program conducted these meetings. Redesign Team members did not attend to ensure open and honest dialogue.

Two sessions were held statewide for internal staff and a third for program managers. With questions of trust being an over-riding concern internally, it was decided to bring in an external facilitator for these sessions. Redesign Team members deferred attendance at these meetings so individuals could feel comfortable about talking openly and freely without concerns of being associated with specific comments. Information from these sessions was collated and summarized, and the minutes were placed on the web site for easy access.

The Redesign Team took the information and started formulating a listing of the needs/issues and then categorized them. Summarized information was then brought back to the internal stakeholders for further definition and categorization. This second set of input sessions occurred in August and again the comments were documented and placed on the web site for access.

In addition to the input sessions, the team sent invitations to a number of key legislators in hope they would visit with representative members from the Redesign Team. The objective was to gain insight on issues important to them as well as the State in general. Invitations were accepted and one-on-one sessions were held with two legislators.[3] Notes from these discussions were placed on the web.

The second set of internal input sessions, noted above, was very successful. From these came more defined issues and concerns as well as suggestions on ways to start addressing them. This information was synthesized down and developed into an "Opportunities Matrix" (Appendix D). The specific improvement opportunities fit into the following categories: customer service, innovation, training, management and process, environment, and financial. The Opportunities

---

[2] Peter Peshek, DeWitt Ross & Stevens; Mark Thimke, Foley and Lardner; Mark Giesfeldt, Remediation and Redevelopment Bureau Director; Eileen Pierce and Caroline Garber, Section Chiefs, Air Management Bureau; Jim Schmidt, Remediation Team Supervisor, Southeast Region; Kevin Kessler, Air & Waste Division; Mark McDermid, Cooperative Environmental Assistance Bureau Director.

[3] Representative DuWayne Johnsrud; Senator Neal Kedzie; Suzanne Bangert, Cynthia Moore, and John Melby from the Redesign Team.

Matrix became the primary document from which solutions would be developed including changes to our management systems, our program structure and the direction for the long-term future of the program.

A third set of input sessions, including external partners, were held in December, 2004. These sessions presented draft proposals on changes to program management systems, future activities of the program, and two potential structure changes for the central office. Again, comments from these sessions, and follow-up e-mails, were documented and placed on the web site for review.

Summaries and reports of these input sessions can be found at:

http://dnr.wi.gov/org/aw/wm/redesign/reports/reports.html

The "Final Report: External Stakeholder Input" from the June and July meetings is found in Appendix B. This report is also found in the above cited web site.

The report "Facilitator's Summary Report and Analysis of Internal Stakeholders' Input" from the July 2004 meetings is found in Appendix C. Again, this report is also found in the above cited web site.

An examination of what other states are doing in the areas of innovation and organization has also helped to inform the redesign process. Notes on this work can be found in Appendix E.

Future Management Systems Recommendations

Summary

The "Redesign Management Systems Recommendations" include specific recommendations received from both internal and external stakeholders, as well as the collective work of the Redesign Team. They also take into account the successes other states have had. And, finally, they build on the strengths of the current program, while recognizing the need for continued improvement.

The future program management systems incorporate key concepts across all of our business functions that:
- Strive to attain higher environmental performance through innovative and beyond compliance initiatives to support our vision of "Zero Waste";
- Streamline our regulatory processes and implement innovative approaches;
- Emphasize effective communication and stakeholder involvement and partnerships;
- Increase the use of information technology to share and manage data as well as provide transparency; and
- Build trust and accountability into both internal and external relationships.

Specific elements within these management systems recommendations that provide for adaptability and more effective use of resources include:
- Use of Green Tier;
- Use of Environmental Results Programs that allow for self-certification within a sector;
- Limiting the number of staff that perform specific tasks within the program;
- Focusing inspection and enforcement work in those areas of greatest potential environmental impact;
- Putting more information and data on the web;
- Partnering with stakeholders on strategic issues such as illegal open burning and changes to the recycling program, and
- Creating an ongoing stakeholder group similar to the Brownfield Study Group.

Performance measures have been developed to track and ensure progress in meeting redesign commitments. These near term performance measures are:
- Improve timeliness, predictability and consistency of decisions in all program areas.
- Improve collaboration and trust with HW, SW and Recycling stakeholders.
- Ensure personnel have the skills to perform assigned tasks and stay abreast of industry technology.
- Shift the focus of the Waste Management Program and stakeholders to waste and materials management.
- Become a data-driven decision making organization in which decisions are transparent to external and internal stakeholders.

The following are the "Redesign Management Systems Recommendations" by key business functions. Included are a brief pro and con analysis and a comparison to the current state. More detailed narratives of key aspects of the management systems recommendations are found in Appendix F.

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REDESIGN MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS: CURRENT AND FUTURE

Business Function	Future Management System Options	Pros	Cons	Current Management System
PLAN REVIEW AND LICENSING	• Green tier (HW, SPW) – 2 TSD facilities, as a pilot – Long-term – all 18 TSDs – Designate 2 staff to lead work effort	-save staff time - improved environment benefit -less command & control (C&C)	-EPA agreement -staff training	Decentralized traditional re-licensing of TSDs, any specialist or engineer in region can be assigned
	• Streamline licensing process, for those not interested or qualified for Green Tier (HW, SPW, SW) - Continue SW Streamlining Process: - Reduce review of 'as-builts', - Increase on-site construction inspections; - ID precedent setting issues for review; - Complete data model flow chart in detail - Designate 2 staff to specialize in HW licensing	- save staff time - quicker service - better use of staff time	-less oversite by DNR on some activities	Current NR 500 proposed revisions will provide streamlining of certain solid waste plan review activities. Hazardous waste re-licensing not streamlined
	• Self Certification (SPW, RCY, SW) - For RCY, require Self Cert. of currently exempt facilities - Non-complex SW facilities (transfer, compost, one-time disposal, low hazard) 300 – 500 facilities	-save staff time - facility is responsible -less C&C -cover more facilities -better environ. protection -increases reg. authority and fee generation for some facilities (RCY) -level playing field	-higher risk due to less oversite -staff acceptance - environ. group acceptance -this is a diverse group/loss of control -significant outreach investment -more workload (us and them) (RCY) -statutory changes	Some 'self-certification'-like proposals in NR 500 proposed revisions for Solid Waste. None for the other program areas.
	• Long Term – Evaluate using a company wide approval (SW)	-see above -improve integration - may improve efficiency - consistency	-see above - - issues related to siting, capacity, enforcement need to be worked out - staff reassignments may be necessary - extra fee probably assessed	Not Available in current program

Business Function	Future Management System Options	Pros	Cons	Current Management System
	• Technical review "process" **(SW)** – Hydro and Engineer experts (1 each) oversee plan review assignments and work in collaboration with the regional team supervisors – Designate specific hydros and engineers to do landfill and incinerator reviews (propose 8 each) – Experts would review all plan review decisions that are unusual and precedent setting – Guidance on what is unusual and precedent setting, and accountability – Signature authority is Regional Supervisor, plan reviewers – Experts would ensure up-to-date technical knowledge of plan review and work on mentoring amongst designated plan review staff	-Consistency -Timeliness -Fair workload distribution - Better training and mentoring opportunities	-Unclear lines of authority -Dispute resolution Less flexibility for regions to assign other work	Any regional engineer or hydrogeologist can be assigned a solid waste landfill or complex facility plan review. Presently 11 hydros and 11.25 engineers in the regions. All precedent setting/unusual is supposed to go through experts.
INSPECTIONS, AUDITS, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS	• Green Tier Facilities **(HW, SPW, SW)** – part of 5 year license – spot checks	- better use of limited resources - more buy-in - focus on the greatest environ. impact - move to less use of toxics - move towards Zero waste	-increased risk -EPA agreement	Not available in current systems
	Focus inspections on small and very small quantity generators **(HW)**	- help small & very small understand laws better	- time consuming - EPA agreement	Focus first on LQGs then SQGs and VSQs – no reliance on data to determine priorities
	Self reporting of self audits **(HW)** - e-transfer of the information	-efficiency -customer service	- reliance on company to self-disclose	Not available in current system. DNR conducts audits on facilities.
	Work with local units of government (e.g. health and fire depts.) To do joint inspections etc. **(HW)**	-efficiency -partnerships	- local resource constraints - training	Not done in this area.
	Self inspections and report for sites, with reduced DNR inspections **(SW)**	-trust, efficiency -customer service	-risk -$ -time c	No self inspections, DNR inspections are limited given workload considerations
	Staff use "notebooks" w/ electronic upload of inspection **(HW, SPW, SW, RCY)**	-efficiency	- $	Not available at this time.

Business Function	Future Management System Options	Pros	Cons	Current Management System
	Online inspection check lists available to all stakeholders **(HW, SPW, SW, RCY)**	- transparency - trust - customer service	- $ - time to develop	We do not have these check-lists available for stakeholders
	Electronic submittal of annual reports w/ 1 hard copy, until placed in SHWIMS **(HW, SPW, SW, RCY)**	-efficiency -customer service	- $	Working on a pilot with UW SHWEC
	Workload distributed across regional boundaries **(HW, SPW, SW, RCY)**	-efficiency -responsiveness	- less flexibility	Some sharing of workload in SW plan review and HW licensing
	Emphasize getting companies to Green Tier **(HW, SPW, SW,)**	-trust -environmental benefit	- time commitment	Green Tier not in use yet – pilot in works
	For low impact facilities (ex. transfer stations, compost facilities), inspect only if a complaint **(SW)**	-staff time -efficiency	- potential environ. risk - public expectations	Inspection frequency probably low for most of these facilities due to work load constraints.
	Drop RU program evaluations – replace with outreach **(RCY)**	-staff time to focus on waste reduction	-legislative questions -less contact with local govt. -change management issue w/-staff & locals	RU program evaluations conducted in each region.
	• Self reporting with checklist **(SPW)** - no DNR inspect - targeted audits or complaint based to follow-up on self-certification	-facility more accountable -trust -less staff time	-risk	Check-list is available, no requirement to self-inspect and report
	• Short-term: Centralize audit function (1-2 staff) **(NMM)** • Long-term: Drop audit function – it becomes a county function **(NMM)**	-less staff time -efficiency -consistency -local govt. runs their business	-could lose consistency -staff resistance -reduced fees	Audits decentralized; statutory requirements for the program
POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND GUIDANCE – PROCESS: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL	Use EMS Policy Process template program wide **(HW, SW, SPW, RCY, NMM)**	-consistency -efficiency -ease of understanding -more extensive, inclusive involvement -multiple value set	-skill sets -discomfort with stkhldrs. involvement -perception-politicizes program -currently more time intensive - net might be less	EMS process has been used in limited situations

Business Function	Future Management System Options	Pros	Cons	Current Management System
POLICY DEVELOPMENT WHAT POLICIES MOVE US FORWARD	Use more enforcement discretion memos to allow best management of waste **(SPW, HW, SW)**	- efficiencies	- risk - legal	Special Waste has successfully used enforcement discretion memo for WI specific Universal Wastes to encourage proper reuse and recycling
	Green Tier – define to satisfy EPA's issues **(HW< SPW)**	- environ. benefit	- time - EPA agreement	Not currently in use
	Mid- term: - Coordinate timing of fees and annual report submittal - Create incentive for RAs to resume program implementation Long term: Sunset state oversight **(NMM)**	-efficiency -customer service	-temporary funding issues	Statutory requirement to conduct the program, no incentives for counties to take the program back
	Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Recycling and Reuse Program(RCY, **SPW, SW**) Comprehensive review of the Recycling Prgm. - ban Hg in products, - promote reuse and recycling, - product stewardship, - shared responsibility, - change enforcement procedures to be easier and more realistic, - change grant program formula	- environ. benefit - efficiencies	- time - statutory changes	Not in existence
	Formalize licensing with respect to use of EMS **(HW)**	- environ. benefit	- EPA agreement	In pilot phase now for one facility
	Allow pollution reduction credits **(HW)**	- flexibility for companies	- not clear how what this means for waste program	Not defined, and not in use
	Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force - out of state waste, landfill capacity, fees	- emviron. benefit - public discussion	- time	Not in existence
	Revisions to Waste Policy: **(SW)** • Revise Statute 289 and 287 from "Solid Waste" to "Solid Waste Facilities" • Fee measures • Performance based requirements • Better define roles and responsibilities • Encourage through policy: Moving towards Zero waste; Manufacturers Responsibility	- broader application - clarity	- statutory change (time)	Statutes specify solid waste facilities not solid waste

Business Function	Future Management System Options		Pros	Cons	Current Management System
OUTREACH AND EDUCATION	• Comprehensive outreach plan with dedicated resources (ALL, unless otherwise indicated) ✓ Annual WM report to educate/inform public - *include WEB resource on how to best manage waste* ✓ Partner with Green Tier leader companies to help other companies (HW) ✓ "RU Days" (specific outreach meeting involving a number of the RUs)(RCY) - *develop new materials* ✓ Partner with trade groups to establish a research function ✓ Beyond Compliance ✓ On-going stakeholder group ✓ Continue internal & external focus groups ✓ Develop staff and skill for staff outreach ✓ Use IT (WEB) more broadly and effectively - *Improve WEB Site* - *look at medical waste as an example of how to use WEB* ✓ Educate municipalities to do more locally with oddball waste - *try to find money* ✓ Work with legislators ✓ Continue open burning initiatives ✓ Develop resources for teachers		-save staff time -empower customers -place responsibility where it belongs	-resources -need to develop skill sets -hard to measure accomplishment	No editing capabilities exist in the program currently. No comprehensive communication plan in existence, tho pieces of communication plan exist
ENFORCEMENT	ALL • Targeted citation- low impact facilities- quick and easy • Target enforcement based on waste hierarchy • Revamp enforcement process and make clear • Bring recycling in line with other programs in terms of enforcement (stepped enforcement) • WEB listing of enforcement actions • Stop taking enforcement action (e.g., RU effective program, facilities with little or no environmental or health impacts)		-consistency -reduce time -EPA will like	-change in legislation -multiple divisions -backlash wrt a WEB listing or not taking enforcement action with some facilities	Enforcement process has not been revised for many years. Web not used for transparency in enforcement (?)

Business Function	Future Management System Options	Pros	Cons	Current Management System
TECHNICAL & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE	**ALL** • Develop comprehensive plan for Assistance - Guidance on the WEB - use all kinds of technology for meetings, collaboration - Selected Site Visits • USE THE WEB, more - Technical contact list - use "PUSH" technology - make it easier to find and use information • Use trade associations- partner or have them take lead • Take advantage of offers- industry and EPA, local units of government • Limit span of program responsibility - specialty areas for generalists	-will improve efficiency -encourages partnerships	-resource intensive -need to develop skill sets	No comprehensive plan exists for this
COMPLAINT RESPONSE	• Target which complaints to respond to • Use IT - Auto response - Analyze - Complaints on-line - Track - Route complaints • Who owns complaint - cooperate efforts between programs • Staff needs clear guidance on how to provide response to complaints	-environment benefit -time savings -staff time -better mgmt. -consistency -time, one letter -customer service - less confusing	-concerns over not responding -$ -skills -Change mgmt.	Complaint response triage exists in HW program, and was developed for SW program (no evaluation on whether it's being used and how effective it is in getting at the real problems). No on-line capability.
DATA USE AND MANAGEMENT	• Correct data, easy to use, used to set priorities, evaluate program, manage & assign resources • Department wide data submittal- coordinated (ex lab data) • Move to electronic reporting & certification - bJ-directional • Be more transparent and accessible (available to externals and internals) • Consolidate and integrate systems - include EPA & other state agencies • Better use of new technology- video conference • E-forms and checklists • Need to get useful information back out	-efficient -consistency -managed -data based decisions -ease for customers	-need support staff -develop staff skills -costs $ -analysis skills -cross agency, multiple agency	Data Model under development, much work to do to integrate and move to automated systems.

Business Function	Future Management System Options	Pros	Cons	Current Management System
PROGRAM SUPPORT - NEEDS TO BE EVALUATED AND DISCUSSED	Additional program assistant (PA) needs were identified as an issue. Separate recommendations on future system not made at this time.			Currently 8 regional managers and 4 section chiefs; 1 PA for each region and 1 PA in the bureau, along with an office manager.

HW = Hazardous Waste Program
SPW = Special Waste Program (those wastes that are part of the federal Universal Waste category, or which could fall within either solid or hazardous waste rules)
RCY = Recycling Program
SW = Solid Waste Program
NMN = Non-Metallic Mining Program

wrt = with respect to

Self Certification = A system where the facility certifies that they are in compliance with state laws, and receives no DNR review or plan approval, and may or may not receive a license or other authorization.

Targeted Inspections = DNR selects a sector or geographic area to inspect, or selects facility to inspect to verify effectiveness of self-certification.

Designated staff or Specialty Teams = A small number of staff designated to work on specific activity (examples: HW licensing, sector inspection team, etc)

Electronic submittals or WEB use = Use of the WEB to submit applications, inspection information, self-certification forms (example: Recycling Annual Reports)

Changes to Program Structure and Organization

Significant structural changes are recommended to support the management systems of the future. The recommended organization structure for the Bureau is identified in Appendix H and a summary of the changes relative to the current bureau organization are also shown in the table at the end of this narrative.

In the Bureau, the number of sections will be reduced from four to three. The three sections and their staff will now be organized along programmatic lines versus the previous functional alignment. The reduction in the number of sections results from past and future workforce reduction considerations. The change in how the sections will be organized reflects many internal and external comments regarding the need for greater clarity on programmatic responsibilities. This change will improve staff work efficiency and greatly assist stakeholders in determining proper contacts within the Waste and Materials Management Program.

Programmatic standing teams as they currently exist will be eliminated, and sections within the Bureau will provide coordination of sub-programs. Functional teams and/or ad hoc teams will be used for special efforts or to address issues with implications for multiple programmatic areas.

The restructured Bureau will also result in changes in the manner in which Regions interact with the Bureau and implement certain aspects of the program. Regions will no longer have Sub-Team Leaders. While no relocation of staff will likely occur as a result of these changes, staff will regularly work across regional lines where this makes sense from workload or expertise standpoints.

A limited number of staff will be designated to perform hazardous waste facility relicensing activities for the entire state. Consolidating these activities at one or two locations will result in improved efficiencies in completing the work.

Other staff will be designated to perform solid waste landfill plan review and oversight. The role of the waste management specialist in certain types of solid waste plan reviews and landfill inspections is expected to change. Their skills and dedication have helped to make Wisconsin's landfill program one of the strongest in the nation. However, the decentralization of some of the plan review responsibilities to the Regions has allowed other solid waste staff to provide oversight of landfill operations. Solid waste engineers and hydrogeologists can provide adequate oversight at landfills and the waste management specialists time and talents can be used more productively in other waste management areas with minimal time applied to active landfill sites. This change has already been implemented in several Regions. This recommendation will make operations in this area consistent statewide.

In addition, staff will be assigned responsibility for not more than two programmatic areas, where practical. These possible assignments include: solid waste, hazardous waste (including special waste), recycling, and mining. Regional staff responsibilities will shift from some of the current traditional work to a stronger focus on Green Tier related work, other beyond compliance work, outreach, and other new approaches related to the recommendations in this report.

Comparison of Existing and Proposed Organizational Structure

	Existing Structure	Proposed	Significant Change
Central Office	4 Sections: • Policy • Planning & Evaluation • Technical Support • Administrative Services	3 Sections: • Recycling and Solid Waste Management • Hazardous Waste Prevention and Management • Business Support and Information Technology	Sections and their staff previously organized along functional lines. Proposed organization is along programmatic lines.
Regions	Organized on geographic basis. Subteam leaders in 4 of 5 Regions.	Still organized by geography, but significant changes.	Subteam leader positions eliminated, and procedures established to facilitate greater sharing of staff across regional lines. Certain staff would be dedicated for work on hazardous waste relicensing and on landfill plan review and oversight.
Team Structure	Sub-programs are coordinated by standing teams; specific efforts are often coordinated through ad hoc teams.	Coordination of sub-programs to be provided by Sections within Bureau. Ad hoc teams used for specific efforts.	Standing teams would no longer exist as they are currently constituted.

Program Redesign Implementation

Critical to the success of the redesign process is the implementation plan. This plan places an emphasis on ensuring that proposed changes are completed within a set time-frame. It provides a rough schedule for implementation of various pieces, performance measures to track progress, and activity worksheets for the key initial projects.

Along with the many other considerations that must be noted, implementation of the proposed redesign will have to consider the FY 05-07 budget reduction plan. The redesign recommendation proposes to begin implementation on or about July 1, 2005 and includes the staffing reductions that were previously assumed to be happening at that time. However it is expected at this point that we will not actually have to cut those position until possibly June 30, 2006 or 2007. The Department Leadership Team will not allow a lay-off outside of the context of budget-based work force reduction requirements. It will be a great loss to the program to release positions before we were required through the budget process. Consequently, efforts will be made to utilize these positions until we are required to eliminate them. This may be done through temporary assignments to work needed for program priorities and/or redesign implementation. We have included Human Resources as a participant in the implementation plans in order to address what options are available.

In addition, position descriptions will be revised as necessary to better address the staffing needs of the program. Throughout the process, every effort will be made to be the least disruptive to people's lives. The objective is to have people being more satisfied with their job duties and still fulfill the needs of the program for the future.

Implementation Plan

The first item in the implementation plan is a chart indicating changes that need to be implemented and a ranking system indicating if implementation will be completed within the near, medium or long term (Appendix I). The timeframes have been defined as:

➢ Near term: 0-1 year
➢ Medium term: 2-3 years
➢ Long term: 3-5 years

These definitions recognize the following: that the program does not have adequate resources to tackle too many of these issues at one time; timing issues relative to budget implementation; and the need to be able to complete the core work required on a day-to-day basis.

Five key components in the near term category of issues are the foundation for building of the redesign. These are:

➢ Implementation of the organizational structure.
➢ Changes to the solid waste plan approval and hazardous waste licensing process.
➢ Defining program decision-making process.
➢ Providing ability to post plan approvals on the internet (initially solid waste facility approvals).
➢ Governors Blue Ribbon Task Force addressing solid waste and recycling initiatives (this is a place holder at this time based on initial indications that the Governor may take this issue up within this budget cycle).

Along with these five, a number of near term projects already in progress exist including:

➢ EMS project with SC Johnson to address issues of hazardous waste licensing
➢ Sector charter with WISRI
➢ Plan review streamlining rules and guidance.
➢ Open burning initiative.
➢ Sortable guidance on the internet.
➢ Conceptual data management model.
➢ GEMS/SHWIMS on the internet.

An implementation activity worksheet is available for each of the near term projects (see Appendix J). The worksheets identify the work to be completed, the sideboards, resources required (including staffing and hours), and a timeline. Once the redesign report has been approved, specific staff will be identified to work on the various projects, based on their interest and work skills. An overall expectation of the teams working on these implementation projects is that the process will continue to be transparent and open, and will include input from both our internal and external stakeholders.

Performance Measures

The Waste Materials and Management Program is committed to the success of the program redesign. In order to assure progress is being made, a number of performance measures will track progress. These measures will enable the program managers and stakeholders to evaluate our progress and success in meeting the goals of redesign effort.

These performance measures consist of Outcomes, Measures/Outputs and Strategies/Tools/Activities.

- Outcomes are the improvements expected as part of the redesign process implementation.
- Measure/Outputs are information (data) or products used to determine whether progress is being made on achieving the desired outcome.
- Strategies/Tools/Activities are things that are being done to make progress toward the desired outcome. Not all strategies/outputs/activities are measured.

While the Waste and Materials Management Program has many performance measures to assess the effectiveness of our programs, the following five performance measures have been developed specifically for our program redesign efforts (see Appendix K for more details):

- Improvement in timeliness, predictability and consistency of decisions in all program areas.
- Improvement in collaboration and trust with HW, SW and Recycling stakeholders.
- Personnel have the skills to perform assigned tasks and stay abreast of industry technology.
- Shift the focus of the Waste Management Program and stakeholders to waste and materials management.
- Become a data-driven decision making organization in which decisions are transparent to external and internal stakeholders.

Conclusions

The recommendations in this report strengthen the Waste and Materials Management Program and position the program to improve its effectiveness in the future. They provide for a Program which is better able to adapt to the needs of the future. This redesign is one more step in the Waste and Materials Management Program's on-going efforts to improve protection of the environment and service to the citizens of Wisconsin. Changes and modifications to the recommendations in this redesign will certainly occur during implementation. This redesign provides a framework within which a smooth transition will occur, and which provides for measurement of success and accountability for that implementation. While additional changes may occur that were not anticipated through the course of this redesign that could ultimately affect implementation, many of these recommendations position the program to be adaptable to those changes, and must happen if the program is to meet the needs of the future. Expeditious implementation of these recommendations means that we will more quickly realize their value.

The Redesign Team offers their sincere thanks to all the people, those within the Department and from outside the agency, who gave their time and abilities to help shape this report. We especially want to thank Susan Puntillo, Jane Washburn and Lindsey Miller for their support and assistance.

Appendix A: Waste Program Redesign Communication Plan

Activity	Type of Information	Process	Responsible Party	Intended Audience	Method	Time Frame
General information	Problem Statement & Objectives	Prepared at beginning of process	SB	WA State Externals	Internet	May 2004
	Schedule & schedule modifications	Prepared at beginning of process and updated as necessary	SB	WA State Externals	Internet	May 2004 with updates as necessary
	Communication Plan		BH, CM	WA State Externals	Internet	Post by May 15, 2004
	What's New from Sue	Bi-weekly update, even if no news!	SB	WA State	e-mail	1st and 3rd Monday of each month
	"Listening" sessions about redesign	Regions, CO, external	SB, WMPR	WA State	Face-to-face, conference call	Throughout
Meeting Documents	Agenda & attachments	Posted in advance of meetings	SB	WA State Externals	Internet	1 Wk prior to meeting
	Draft meeting notes	Note taking assigned to WMPR on rotating basis – take notes, post draft and finalize	WMPR	WA State Externals	Internet	Post draft to WMPR 3 days after meeting; Comments due back from WMPR w/in 3 days of posting;
	Final notes and handouts	Post on internet	WMPR	WA State Externals	Internet	Post final w/in 3 days after comments returned
Resources	Special Reports or documents: • Streamlining Update • Code revisions • Budget Impacts		DM Moore, Connelly Hellenbrand	WA State Externals	Internet Notify WA staff by e-mail	Monthly updates or as available
Interim Deliverables	• Benchmark w/other states • Draft preliminary recommendations		Antonuk, Lynch WMPR	WA State Externals	Internet Notify WA staff by e-mail	June 30, 2004 September 30, 2004
Final Report	Draft Plan/Report		WMPR	WA State Externals	Internet Notify WA staff by e-mail	Nov 30, 2004
	Final Plan/Report		WMPR	WA State Div Admin,AWTR Externals	Internet Notify WA staff by e-mail	Dec 31, 2004

Appendix B: Final Report: External Focus Group
8-5-04

Executive Summary

Over the past month 5 facilitated focus group sessions were held with the major constituent groups affected by program areas managed by the Bureau of Waste Management. The groups were very pleased to be asked to participate in these sessions and came well prepared. They viewed the sessions as a good first step and hoped the openness would continue.

Overall they were very complimentary to the staff and their professionalism. They find staff helpful, well informed and customer focused. They like the local contacts and felt the regional staff knew their business better than the central office.

They feel they support the program externally. They are frustrated by what they feel are internal warring factions, discrepancies in how different staff interpret the laws and rules and work with them. Their biggest overall concerns were on timeliness, ease of access to information and clarity and consistency in interpretation of statutes and rules.

Methodology

Five separate focus group sessions were held. Each session lasted two hours and the groups had questions tailored to their specific industry. The questions were sent to the participants ahead of time. Focus group minutes were sent to the participants and they were given an opportunity to make changes or additions. No changes were submitted.

Structural Concerns

Culture - There was a strong and consistent theme around culture. When probed a little it seemed that although there was some differences between central office and regional offices it was more than that. It was described as conservative and progressive. They also focused on an unwillingness to take risk. It also seemed to be as much across programs as well as across the state. They seemed very aware of internal issues and trust problems.

Program Communication – There was a general theme around communication covering issues between central office and regions and from one program to another. They felt communication was not timely. They did however very much like the sharing of draft documents. Citizen groups felt they were shut out of the process and it is difficult to get information or make copies of things. They made it clear it was a convenience not a cost problem.

Redundancies – Concerns that the state recalculates everything on the application or when moving from one stage of a project to another were voiced as discussions on efficiency evolved. It was felt that no value was added and indeed it constituted a waste of resources to redo calculations.
Staff – Although they were supportive of staff they also felt that there were not enough staff and that although staff are technically proficient there was a general concern that there is not enough training. This could be real or just a projection based on their concerns that the programs are not adequately funded.
Management – There were several comments about management. In general the comments were directed at supervisors not addressing communication and staff performance issues.

Process Concerns

Time – Almost every group had comments on timeliness. They felt that they did not care what the timeline was, just that once WDNR committed to a date they stuck to it. They felt very strongly that WDNR repeatedly missed dates set internally and missed them by a significant amount of time. A

specific problem was raised (although for very different reasons) about the contested case process that had significant issues raised late in the process when the potential to affect the overall outcome is limited. The environmental groups were concerned about time and the fact that they felt they were being cut out of the contested case hearings.

Cost – No one really complained about costs. They felt that they supported recent requests for increases. They do feel that they are not getting what they pay for. In addition, the consultants felt that WDNR was not aware enough of the costs to site a landfill, etc.

Science – There was a general feeling that WDNR is slow to accept scientific findings from other groups and slow to make changes based on new – yet proven – technologies.

There was a side theme that addressed alternative approaches to regulation to encourage companies to go beyond compliance. They would like WDNR to look at programs in other state agencies (DATCP and Commerce) and other states.
Consistency – There was strong sentiment concerning consistency. They felt that our programs, laws, and rules are not being interpreted consistently, we are not predictable, nor clear in our communications.

Enforcement – Would like to see more targeted enforcement. Go after the bad performers and let the good ones do self-reporting with spot checks.

Funding Issues
Need adequate funding – concerns around staff education and training, ability to get to sites or information sharing events, etc. Voiced concern that recycling will not be funded, that the funding is promised and slow to be disbursed. Would like to see outreach and targeted programs refreshed and supported.

Futures
Several topics were touched upon as either future trends in the industry or areas for program perspectives to change. These were touched on only briefly, but should be included as they may help point to areas to focus on or different ways to focus our resources. These were:

♦ Use technology more – web and electronic submittals
♦ Broaden our perspectives – look at land use, reclamation,
♦ Expand manufacturer's responsibility for waste stream management
♦ Resurrect regional meetings, TAGs, information exchanges
♦ Fewer municipal landfills
♦ Green Tier
♦ Self-certification
♦ Develop checklists
♦ Single stream recycling
♦ Create a core group to review alternatives, new technology and research from other groups
♦ Smart Growth

Overlap Between Internal and External Focus Groups
Although not an actual part of the external focus group sessions, it is worth noting that although there are the expected differences of opinion expressed from the regulated and regulator viewpoints there are many areas where there were substantially similar comments. This will probably be reported on in more

detail in the report on the internal focus group session. However, the major areas of agreement: management needs to manage, staffing needs to increase, funding needs to be adequate, staff need to be supported both technically and administratively, the rift between different parts of the program need to be addressed, and communication needs to improve.

Appendix:
- **List of Attendees**
- **List of Questions**
- **Focus Group Minutes**
- **Post Focus Group Meeting e-mail Comments**

Appendix – List of Attendees
Industry – June 29, 2004
Neil Peters-Michaud, Cascade Asset Management
Peter Peshek, DeWitt Ross & Stevens
John Piotrowski, Packaging Corp. of America
Kelly Taylor, Safety-Kleen Systems
Haulers and Landfills – June 30, 2004
Gerard Hamblin, Waste Management Inc.
Jim Hartleben, Wittenberg Disposal
Brian Jongetjes, John's Disposal
Jerry Mandli, SWANA/Dane County
Dan Otzelberger, Mike Etner, Republic Services, Inc.
Todd Watermolen, Onyx Superior Services
Environmental Groups – June 30, 2004
Steve Hiniker, 1000 Friends of Wisconsin
John Imes, Wisconsin Environmental Initiative
Torah Jha, Grassroots Recycling Network
Jenna Kunde, WasteCap Wisconsin
Charlene LeMoine, Russ Evans, Waukesha Environmental Action League
Elizabeth Wheeler
Local Government – July 1, 2004
Bill Casey, WCSWMA (Wisconsin County Solid Waste Managers Assoc.)
Mike Englebart, Milwaukee Public Works
Chuck Larscheid, Brown County Solid Waste
Rick Schneider, NWRPC (North West Regional Planning Commission)
Rick Stadelman, Wisconsin Towns Association
Consultants – July 1, 2004
Tim Ambrosius, CQM Inc.
Steve Bischoff, Ayres Associates
Leslie Busse, BT2
Mark Halleen, Foth & Van Dyke
Joel Schittone, RMT Inc.
Richard Weber,
Hooshang Zeghami, Central Wisconsin Engineers

Appendix – List of Questions used at external focus group sessions

Landfill and Haulers:
1. What are the business needs and technology advances that you believe we should be aware of in issuing solid and hazardous waste approvals and licenses?
2. What business needs are currently not met by our program or in our approvals and permitting?
3. What are the current costs to you in the approval, permitting, licensing we do?
4. What are acceptable costs?
5. What are we doing well in the program?
6. How will you judge if we are successful?
7. What has been your experience in other states in obtaining solid and hazardous waste permits, approvals or licenses?
8. If you could change 3 things about how the Waste Management program operates, what would they be?
9. Do you think changes will actually be made to the program that will help business? Why/Why not?

Industry:
1. Tell us a little bit about how you feel your industry views us as a program and how we do business?
2. What do you believe should be the highest priority of the Waste Management Program in the near term and in years to come?
3. What kind of changes would make this program be perceived as more progressive and innovative?
4. What does it mean for a regulatory program to be adaptive?
5. Help us put into perspective why letting go of some oversight responsibilities and empowering our stakeholders is good for the program and good for Wisconsin.
6. Tell us a little about political realities that we may not see.

Government:
1. What types of activities have you had experience with the waste program – landfills, solid waste facility approvals, composting, recycling, etc.?
2. What of your experience was positive and where could we have done better?
3. Where do you see areas that changes could be made – consider items such as staffing, code/statutory, process, etc.?
4. What issues do you see affecting the waste industry and/or municipalities in the future that we should be anticipating?
5. In your experience, are there innovative approaches that you've seen utilized that could be expanded on and utilized more extensively throughout the state?
6. If you could change 3 things about our solid and our hazardous waste programs what would they be?

Environmental:
1. What experience have you had with the waste program – our regulatory process and rule making?
2. What are we doing well – why is it successful and how could we build on these successes in our work?
3. What are the main issues that we should be aware of in reviewing and issuing solid waste and hazardous waste approvals or in changing our approval process or rules?
4. What changes or approaches do you recommend we adopt to be better positioned to meet changing needs of industry, the environment and our public?
5. How do you compare our program and our regulatory process to other states you work with? Please provide specific examples.
6. If you could change 3 things about our solid and our hazardous waste programs what would they be?

Consultants:

1. What are the business needs and technology advances that you believe we should be aware of in issuing solid and hazardous waste approvals and licenses?
2. What business needs are currently not met by our program or in our approvals and permitting?
3. What are we doing well in the program?
4. How will you judge if we are successful?
5. What has been your experience in other states in obtaining solid and hazardous waste permits, approvals, or licenses?
6. What are the current costs to you in the approval, permitting, and licensing we do? What are the acceptable costs?
7. If you could change 3 things about how the Waste Management program operates, what would they be?
8. Do you think changes will be made to the program that will help business? Why/Why not?

Appendix C: Internal Stakeholder Report

State of Wisconsin
Department of Natural Resources

Waste Management Program Focus Group Series
July of 2004

Facilitator
Summary Report and Analysis

Submitted by:

Bert Stitt
September 13, 2004

DISCLAIMER:
In editing the session reports I have removed without acknowledgement any statements that might be
construed as "hearsay," sometimes characterized as "he said she said" statements as well as anything that
constitutes "finger pointing' or blame.

The brainstorming listings and rank orderings are not intended to reflect any scientifically verifiable result
or generalized truth. They indicate a fairly hastily, albeit thorough, bringing together of collective thought
in that moment by those who participated.

In This Summary Report and Analysis I have used only items from the Brainstorming Exercises in the
full reports that received three or more dots.

ACTION:

- **Review the report below**, as well as the full reports from each of the sessions and the participant thoughts submitted by email and included in the appendix, and **pay special attention to the themes**. Use a highlighter and **mark text that resonates for you.**

- Ask yourself this question: "What one or two themes from among those listed in this summary report and others you observe from the full report and the appendix which, if we worked **ON** them diligently and did them well, would cause everything else we're trying to do to have a better chance of success?"

- **Think about that.**

- **Engage a dialogue, with everyone in the same room at the same time**: Staff, Mangers, Junior and Senior Administrators, and follow a process for jointly and collaboratively deciding which one, two or possibly three things you will take on and leverage the outcomes of that effort for greater efficacy in other areas.

- Know that as you undertake such an endeavor and while you are engaged in it **unexpected benefits will begin to happen** in the other more practical areas of the Waste Management Program.

- Do not stop everything you are doing. **Engage in a practical, parallel process** that will give you lateral support for your more technical and day-to-day efforts.

CHANGE: Grounding the Focus Group process

The root cause of successful change process: Dignity, respect, trust and kept promises *(Adapted from Appreciative Inquiry "Dream" statement)*

It's **difficult to change any complex system**. It's even **harder to change attitude, and it is more important**. How do you make change in a complex system? Focus on outcomes (not issues) and work with short-term goals.
(Mission Improbable, by Clark Lee)

How can we learn not only about technique but about value; **how can we change our minds about what is important**, change our understanding and appreciation of what matters, and, more, **change our practical sense about what we can do together?** … *(The Deliberative Practitioner by John Forester)*

THE APPROACH, Appreciative Inquiry:

As I undertook pre-focus group inquiry into this initiative it became clear to me that the framing questions as presented were not conducive to encouraging a positive frame of mind about all of this.

If we want to move an organizational culture to a more positive level, it is important that we examine how we ask questions. To that end I drew on the fundamentals of the Appreciative Inquiry process to articulate a set of positive questions using the basic language of: "What are you hopes and wishes for a healthy and vital …?"

Please see "Questions as Originally framed and as framed by Appreciative Inquiry Principles" in the appendix.

While I always received and honored the urge on the part of participants in the Focus Groups to vent their frustration and anger, I also gently, but firmly, guided them into an exercise of addressing the positive inquiry by asking **"What are your hopes and wishes for a vital and healthy Waste Management Program Re-design initiative and product."**

This approach succeeded, I think, in helping to elucidate a real desire for an improved culture of cooperation, trust, equity, respect, and honesty within the program. It propelled the participants to think about what they agreed will work rather than putting them into the spin of disagreeing about what will or will not work.

WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO WORK <u>ON</u>?

What is that thing, which, if you do it well and skillfully, it will position everything else you try to do for a higher chance of success? Conversely, what is that thing, which, if you do not address it skillfully, you will increase the risk of failure in everything else you try to do?

As you review the various elements of this report you will begin to understand, I think, that the re-design initiative requires an adjustment as to what is really important.

I am reminded of a bit of advice from the business world: "It is important that you spend more time **ON** your business than **IN** your business.

If you are going to make real improvements, there are several areas that everyone involved will undertake more productively if they start working **ON** such things as **language, trust, core values, equity, personal responsibility and more**.

It will not suffice for the people involved to simply say, 'we must build trust.' for example. It will require learning together about how trust is created and maintained in an organization. Without a shared understanding of what constitutes trust it will be very difficult to build it.

LANGUAGE:

"Words are too awful an instrument for good and evil to be trifled with." (William Wordsworth)

Throughout this facilitation I have been struck by a kind of disassociative language used by participants.

In response to questions regarding hopes and wishes **so many of the statements in both of the staff focus groups used the word 'would,'** a passive verb, where **'will,'** the *active* verb, best provides the strength of intention and accountability for the statement.,

Similarly, **many statements in both staff and manager focus groups did not use pronouns such as 'I' or 'we'** when making their Hopes and Wishes statements. This indicates that the individual speaking is not taking responsibility for the hope/wish intention.

It is important to recognize that I did not ask people to respond in any particular way except to indicate their Hopes and Wishes. This is to say; I could have requested that participants use pronouns and active

verbs, possibly 'training' them in the moment to understand the importance of being assertive and taking responsibility.

Some examples:
A. "Redesign … (will) result in a bottom-up rather than a top-down program management system." [The three dots in this sentence represent the word 'would.' The parentheses around the 'will' represent the insertion of that word.

B. "(We will) develop a consistent structured approach for complaint investigation." [The parentheses here represent my edit to add the pronoun 'We' and the active verb 'will' to a sentence that did not acknowledge accountability for the wish nor include an active verb indicating the intention to **make** it happen.]

Language is one of the elements that create "reality." (See Assumptions of Appreciative Inquiry in the appendix.) If we use passive verbs and do not use pronouns, we create the "reality" that this *could* happen; and *if* it happens, it will not be because anyone is accountable for it to happen. This does not constitute a healthy reality!

So much of the language in the first draft of the report (and particularly among staff) is the language of the victim without accountability. This cannot contribute to a healthy program let alone a redesign process.

Conversely, the language I read from reports of processes in 2001 about the work and efficacy of teams in the Air and Waste Management Programs was dominated by "needs" and "Shoulds."

These words operate antithetically to the concept of "Teams." Teams do not undertake their own work or the work of others in terms of what "**we need**" and what "**you should do**." Teams work collaboratively to identify what they **have** and then collaboratively identify what they **can do** and finally take responsibility for what they **will do.**

Recommendation
Individually taking responsibility for your language doesn't have to cost a lot of money and will greatly improve your effectiveness. The Waste Management Program will benefit immeasurably from creating an intention and the strategy for **implementing a culture of improving the consciousness and the effectiveness of language.**

The Center for Creative Living, out of Milwaukee (414.332.3656) http://www.lightly.com) provides excellent classes for a host of personal growth skills. They have inexpensive ($15) classes including, **"Using Your Words Wisely"** and **"When your word becomes law"** among others. I recommend these classes as an offering to interested staff and management members.

Please be conscious that "requiring" or even "expecting" anyone to take such a class will defeat the idea of creating a culture of **taking responsibility for yourself** in matters of becoming a more effective person.

CORE VALUES OF STAFF
I detected a serious level of resentment among staff toward a long litany of Department actions and policies over several years. A good deal of this has to do with the Department's necessary role as intermediary among and between the wishes of the legislature, the expectations of diverse clients, and the core values of staff.

As much as a three-fold request is made of any staff person who is asked to support/regulate/monitor the activities of clients based on changing policies:

A) A staff person may be asked to substantially change the parameters within which she or he uses personal judgment to do work. The request/order to change anything at all puts extra demands on the staff member in terms of time, uncertainty of outcome, possible new training or research and other such requirements.

B) Often this change of parameters can further require the staff member to lose the sense of linear clarity about what is being done and why it is being done. This is especially true when staff is not involved in helping to design and set new policies and procedures. Such changes are often disorienting and confusing

C) Often these changes also challenge the staff member's very sense of core values. I think it's fair to say that most people who come to work at DNR as scientists come because they see it as an opportunity to fulfill themselves by working in an institution that has responsibility for managing the stewardship of the environment, this is something a staff person may feel very passionate about, When a staff member is asked to shift his or her activity or approach in a way that feels compromising of their core values the level of anxiety is very deep.

From what I can tell there is little, if any, effort put into honoring those core values or working with understanding the paradoxes that are set up when those values are challenged.

This is not an easy area to work on. And, if it isn't worked on to understand it better and handle it more skillfully, it will (and has) ultimately demoralize the staff draining energy, productivity, and creativity.

TRUST

The desire for a greater level of trust is a major theme that runs throughout the Focus Group discussions, both staff and managers. It is found in the "Hopes and Wishes" processes, as well as in the venting, the questions, the check-ins and the check-outs.

Following are some sub-themes relevant to the matter of Trust:
- Collaboration
- Professionalism
- Parity with externals
- Staff input with predetermined outcomes
- Timelines/Boundaries/Usefulness
- Trust
- Open and Honest Communication
- Accountability
- Leadership
- Public Involvement
- Better Management
- Openness / Transparency
- Fair and Objective Process…
- The Right People …
- Better Relationships
- Staff Input

These themes constitute various emotions that came up in the focus groups, Hopes and Wishes for a vital and healthy program as well as in the venting of anger, frustration, doubt.

There is an adage in business that 'it is more important to **work on your business** than to work in your business.'

I suggest that the Waste Management Program Managers and **Staff start working ON trust.**

That means, **learn how trust is built… as a generic subject.** Start practicing the known elements of trust in small ways. Whenever you are engaged in issues of the program **ask yourself, 'How am I contributing to building trust here?'**

The Waste Management Program cannot hope to bring forth a truly successful re-design program, without directly addressing the subject of trust.

Recommendation: Invest in providing administrators, managers, and staff with opportunities for seminars, coaching, and follow-through on the techniques of improving trust within the program. Trust will improve as it is demonstrated by dignity, respect and kept promises.

The Center for Creative Learning in Milwaukee (414.332.3656) http://www.lightly.com) offers a course called**, "Ethics: What do You do When No One is Looking?"** and has a process called **"The Ethical Type Indicator."** Learning more about the mechanics of ethics will help enormously in establishing a better environment for trust.

DISONANCE
In the external client, Internal staff, and administrative matrix

The dissonance within the external client, internal staff, and administrative matrix
creates a strong undercurrent of angst that serves to negatively influence everything else you are striving to do. This angst is very evident in the check-in rounds with staff, in particular, expressing a substantial feeling of futility and skepticism as they entered into the focus group discussion.

It seems that there is a lot of alienation experienced on the part of staff in particular as they stand, without the necessary self-preservation tools, amidst the paradoxes, perils and opportunities of this dynamic matrix.

Recommendation: Program leadership (with all interested parties represented at the table) will do well to research, create, and implement 'best practices' in the area of managing this matrix.

EXTERNAL GROUP REVIEW
By the July 7th staff group

The July 7th staff group of about 12 people did a thorough review of the report we had from the external group. The process included indicating levels of comfort with elements of the report by using different sticky dots colors in a multJ-voting process. The entire exercise is available in the July 7th section of the full report.

The Themes that the 7/7 Staff Focus Group identified and prioritized in the External Group Report are:

- Professionalism
- Communication
- Change
- Industry Operations
- Regulation
- Innovation
- Technology
- Costs
- Collaboration,
- Service
- Coordination

This exercise is particularly instructive because it indicates the areas where the staff saw **agreement** with the external group as well as their desire for **more clarity** on particular items and their **disagreement**. There was more agreement than disagreement. This is something that can be built on.

I will address just a couple of items:

Professionalism

A distillation of the group's collective thinking about the report indicates a *high degree of agreement (31 Green Dots) on the part of the internal staff with the external participants' ideas regarding "Professionalism"* in the program.

This desire for professionalism constitutes a very positive theme around which to build more trust and respect.

A close reading of the items that constitute the professionalism theme indicate a sense that while we desire professionalism we do not fully enjoy it now. We have work to do such as, training, mentoring, improving technical skill, predictability and timeliness and more.

Very importantly the use of **the word "professional" often works as a weapon** to judge, stifle, or ostracize, as when someone says, "that's not professional" when, "I don't approve" is what is meant

It is important to foster an environment in which the definitions of professionalism are jointly developed and avoiding things such as "codes of professionalism" that are imposed.

Communication, Collaboration, Cooperation

While these three themes were identified separately I have combined them as **the three C's on which the success of any program rests** to a considerable degree. Together they totaled 25 green dots. Yet another area in which the staff and the externals might find a lot of agreement.

Working to build on areas of agreement will generate positive energy for a better mind-set when you work on areas of disagreement or conflict.

Change

Change is at the top of the list in both the Yellow (desire for clarification) and Red (basic disagreement) and third in the Green column (basic agreement) for a total of 33 dots across the spectrum.

I have addressed the subject of change in the introduction to this summary. Its importance is underscored here. Any change process will have more success with a thorough **examination of the mechanics of change processes and dynamics at the front end** of such an initiative.

HOPES AND WISHES
for a Healthy and Vital <u>Redesign Process and Product</u>
Staff (7/7 <u>and</u> 7/15)

From the two Staff Focus Groups the following major themes emerged:
- Management
- Staff
- Trust
- Process
- The Environment

We established priorities for achieving a healthy and vital redesign process and product.

The list headings that share the **Management** affinity are:
- (Better) Management
- The Right People (in the right position)
- (Stronger) Management
- (Revised) Structure
- Leadership
- Reduce Management Numbers
- Technical Expertise (among managers)

The list headings that share the **Staff** affinity are:
- Effective Staffing Resources
- Staff Development
- Maintain and Improve Technical Expertise
- Designate Program Experts

The list headings that share the **Trust** affinity are:
- Accountability
- Openness/Transparency/ Cooperation – Trust
- Better Relationships
- Respect.

The list headings that share the **Process** affinity are:
- Response to External Concerns
- Fair and Objective Process for Redesign
- Effective Communication
- Public Involvement
- Re-examine the past

The list headings that share the **Environment** affinity are:
- Stewardship / Protect Environment and Individuals
- Environmental Protection

HOPES AND WISHES
For a Healthy and Vital <u>Redesign Process and Product</u>
(Management 7/14)

From this Management Focus Group the major themes that emerged are:
- Organizational Efficiency
- Trust
- Participation/Collaboration/ Open Communication
- Relationships.

HOPES AND WISHES
for a Healthy and Vital Process in <u>Dealing with the Wounds of the Past</u> [Staff (7/7 only)]

From this Staff Focus Group the major themes that emerged are:
- Open and Honest Communication
- Staff Input
- Fair and Equal Stakeholder Input.

QUESTIONS/RESPONSES
[Staff (7/7 <u>and</u> 7/15)]

For the 7/7 session the <u>questions only (a rather lengthy list) were captured</u> and the facilitator organized them into themes for the full report.

In the 7/15 session the group's initial questions were just a few in number. Commentary and response to those questions by the management representative elicited a fairly lengthy list of <u>responses that were captured</u> and the facilitator organized those follow-up questions and comments into themes for the full report.

Below I have distilled these two, somewhat different, sets of information.

The major themes that emerged are:

<u>For 7/7 Session</u>	<u>For 7/15 Session</u>
A) Timelines/Boundaries/Usefulness	A) Lack of Believability
B) Parity with Externals	B) Lack of Trust
C) Staff Input and (the perception of) Predetermined Outcomes	C) External Pressure
	D) Citizen Representation
D) Clarity	E) Integrity of the process
	F) Management/Technical Staff

Appendix D: Waste Management Program Redesign Improvement Opportunities

Update: October 21, 2004

Customer Service	Innovation	Training	Management & Process	Environment	Financial
1. Develop system of communication that produces open exchange and use of ideas (internal & external) and coordinate better with other programs 2. Improve consistency and predictability in decision making so customers know what they are getting 3. Keep deadlines and make timely decisions (cost to business)	1. Improve IT systems to increase efficiency of business processes 2. Enhance internal & external stakeholder relationships to provide opportunities for open discussion of issues 3. Partner with external stakeholders to identify opportunities which encourage risk taking to achieve environmental gains 4. Become; more holistic, ensure results – follow through. 5. Anticipate future needs and issues and take action	1. Train staff in order to maintain technical parity with industry served and to increase staff knowledge of political, social and economic issues and trends – share technology training between industry and DNR 2. Foster support mechanisms among staff(mentoring) 3. Provide staff career ladder-define skill sets for positions	1. Modify business practices and become less process oriented 2. Address centralized vs. decentralized staffing and decision-making 3. Formalize process for internal technical peer review 4. Modify landfill siting and plan review (streamline, less cumbersome) 5. Review code requirements, modify to address both changes in technology and cumbersome applications	1. Confirm commitment to environment and the public 2. Use data to make decisions and track performance in order to show the relationship of this work on impacts to the environment 3. Focus inspections on where get most benefit 4. Find ways to go beyond compliance for more environmental benefit	1. Secure, stabilize and diversify funding sources 2. Adopt positive relationships with our legislators 3. Demonstrate the contribution of "waste as a resource" to environment and long-term financial cost reductions 4. Identify work activities to reduce/eliminate due to budget reductions and manage staff workload

Context: This table is a collection of potential Waste Management Program improvement opportunities suggested by our internal and external stakeholders. Additions or clarifications may be made as redesign discussions continue. Recommended solutions to address these opportunities will be weighed against program redesign criteria to determine inclusion in the redesign. Some of the opportunities appear in more than one category. Opportunities specific to structure will be addressed in a separate document to be addressed after modifications to our business functions have been defined. This is done purposely to ensure that the changes to structure support the management systems and business functions used in the program in the future.

Appendix E: Waste Management Program Redesign State Benchmarking

The Waste Management Program re-design process included reviewing other state's solid and hazardous waste, recycling and non-metallic mining programs. The states that were studied included Minnesota, Ohio, Washington, Oregon and Massachusetts. Website links are provided for each state.

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Minnesota's Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is organized around air, water and land. Organizational changes started in 1998 and continued through 2004. There are approximately 715 FTE in MPCA, down from 800 FTE in 1998. There are 250 staff located in the six regional offices with the remainder stationed in St. Paul, Minnesota. Agency re-organization was a result of new administrations, budget cuts, increasing agency efficiency, programs sunsetting and reduced revenues. The Solid and Hazardous Waste programs reside in the majors and Remediation Division while recycling is in the Office of Environmental Assistance – a sister agency to MPCA. MPCA is currently moving its agency organization toward a media focus, further staff decentralization into regional offices, single point of contact for business/industry and;

- Expedited permits in the solid waste program. An extra fee is charged for expedited permits based on the staff hours and labor rate. Staff have 30 days to determine completeness and 90 days to draft the expedited permit for public review.
- MPCA "Delta" system for information technology with regulated entities
- Use of a tax on solid waste generated in the state to fund the program staff
- Six Sigma – a broad and comprehensive system for building and sustaining performance, success and leadership through improvements in the management process. A data driven process for change.

MPCA websites
http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.cfm
http://www.pca.state.mn.us/about/orgchart.html

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Ohio's programs are split into the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of natural Resources (DNR). The non-metallic mining and recycling programs are located in the DNR with all other programs residing in the EPA. The Ohio EPA central office is located in Columbus Ohio and houses 49 FTEs. The five district offices hold 61 additional FTE. Aspects of Ohio's programs that were reviewed include:

- Small Business Assistance Office – provides a main contact for Ohio's small businesses for permits, licenses and authorizations.
- "Recycle Ohio" program generates $18 million annually to be given to local units of government or cities and counties for recycling program. The $18 million is generated through a tax on businesses that produce any products that produce litter.
- Ohio Health Departments are involved in annual landfill inspections and collect the annual landfill license fee to carry out those inspections.
- Ohio has a Solid Waste Advisory Council – the council has 19 members with representatives from private industry, recycling industry, towns, municipalities, industries, Ohio EPA and DNR. The Council meets four times per year.
- Ohio has a Statewide Solid Waste Management Plan. The plan outlines solid waste management goals for the 88 Ohio counties, which are broken down into 52 solid waste districts.
- Out of state construction and demolition (C & D) waste is a hot topic in Ohio. Concerns with this waste stream include that C & D sites do not need to be permitted and only require a license to operate. Tipping fees are extremely low making it attractive to haul waste in via rail car from out of

state. No annual reports are required. There are no engineering controls or groundwater monitoring requirements.

Ohio Websites

Ohio's EPA Division of Hazardous Waste Management
http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dhwm/offices.html
Ohio's EPA's permitting process for solid waste landfills
http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsiwm/document/guidance/gd_211.pdf
Ohio DNR Division of Recycling and Litter prevention
http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/recycling
Division of mineral Resources Management
http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/mineral/index.html
Ohio's 2001 State Solid Waste Management Plan
http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsiwm/pages/stateplan.html

<div align="center">

Massachusetts

</div>

The Environmental Results program (ERP) – an EPA/State Collaborative Opportunity and the Compliance Certification programs (CCP) were reviewed as part of a one-day seminar held in January 2004 in Wisconsin. In particular, ERP programs active in Massachusetts and Florida were reviewed. Massachusetts has ERP programs with printers, photo processors, dry cleaners, industrial boilers and wastewater tanks, and Stage II vapor Recovery units. Florida has ERP programs with auto repair shops and auto salvage yards. The ERP programs in Massachusetts:

- Enhance and measure performance of facilities/whole business sectors
- Use limited resources more efficiently
- Develop sustainable regulatory systems
- Address cumulative impact of a large number of small sources
- Lower operational costs for states and shifts accountability to regulated entities
- Allows states to target technical assistance and enforcement actions
- Businesses like the more easily understood regulations, plus "best management practices" and pollution prevention techniques
- Businesses like the greater regulatory flexibility to make process changes and lower annual costs
- Associations like "one-stop" reporting and level playing field among facilities.

The Massachusetts Waste program has seen a 25% reduction in staffing levels in the last three years while the permitting and workload has remained fairly steady. Massachusetts has not done too much in streamlining regulations or processes. The state is currently looking at a rule revision package that would require double liners at landfills, expand the beneficial use provisions, allow leachate recirculation, place a ban on C & D waste disposal and eliminate a requirement for municipal waste combustion ash to be disposed of in a monofill.

The Massachusetts ERP program has been very successful in the dry cleaning and photo processing sectors and felt that it has increased compliance within those sectors.

Massachusetts solid waste program is funded primarily through the State's general fund. The agency does charge a minimal review fee and an expedited review fee which are both transferred to the general fund. The fees are not intended to cover program costs. There are not state-imposed fees on disposal.

Massachusetts Links

2004 Progress Report on Waste Program Master Plan for Massachusetts
http://www.mass.gov/dep/bwp/dswm/files/swpr3.doc   (MS Word is necessary to view this document)

Overview of the Massachusetts Environmental Results Program
http://www.mass.gov/dep/erp/about.htm

Information concerning locally-implemented "pay as you throw" programs
http://www.mass.gov/dep/recycle/files/paytfact.htm

Florida DEP Website
http://www.dep.state.fl.us/waste/categories/hazardous/pages/autocert.htm

Washington

Washington's first comprehensive solid waste plan, "Waste Not Washington",focused on technical and financial assistance to local communities. The program funding ended and the agency was forced to cut back. It eliminated its education and outreach programs and reduced its technical support function. The state has seen several years of stagnant recycling rates, which may be attributed to the elimination of the state-coordinated outreach efforts. The original state plan has been replaced with another broad long-range initiative, "Beyond Waste".

Washington is currently working on new code provisions that would allow for more categorical exemptions from permitting requirements, permit deferral and expansion of beneficial reuse exemptions. The categorical exemptions from permitting include fairly detailed location criteria, design guidance, operating standards and reporting requirements. This exemption process included composting facilities and storage areas for "inert" materials. Finally, local health jurisdictions are authorized to issue a single permit to cover multiple solid waste activities at a single location.

Washington does have a Permit Assistance Center to help prospective business applicants. The program does not apply to solid waste permits because these permits are issued by the local health jurisdictions. Permitting of facilities in the pulp and paper industry is coordinated at the state level.   The local health agency staff are responsible for conducting inspections of solid waste facilities.

Washington state solid waste program, including hazardous waste and recycling is generally funded through two separate means, the "toxics tax" imposed on hazardous waste facilities and the "litter tax" which is collected from manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers of items or packaging that contribute to roadside litter.

Future trends in Washington include new waste streams of electronics, program financing and implementation of the Beyond Waste initiative. There have been no new landfill proposals in the State in the past ten years and they do not expect any in the foreseeable future. Oregon accepts 25% of Washington's solid waste.

Washington Links
Home page for the Department of Ecology, Solid Waste and Financial Assistance Program
http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/

Home page for the Beyond Waste initiative
http://www.ecy.wa.gov/beyondwaste/

Beyond Waste Final Plan
http://www.ecy.wa.gov/beyondwaste/finalplan.html

Appendix F: Management System Recommendations Narratives

Trust

A significant problem area identified by both external and internal stakeholders involved the issue of trust – trust between regulated entities and program personnel as well as trust issues within the program. The Program Redesign Team believes that this is a situation that has developed gradually over time and similarly cannot simply be corrected with a few discrete short-term actions. Rather, building trust, both externally and internally must be achieved incrementally. To some extent, most of the systems identified in the recommendations table will in some way help to build a more collaborative and trusting relationship with external stakeholders through such means as enhanced communication and outreach, streamlined processes, self certification and reporting and use of innovative regulatory tools. The issue of internal trust will be most affected by the proposed restructuring of the Bureau, the commitment to adequate staff training, enhanced internal two-way communication and revisions to some of the internal processes. Again, this is not an issue that is amenable to a quick remedy. The Waste and Materials Management Program is committed to improving the nature of its working relationships with both external and internal stakeholders. Implementation of the actions recommended in this report will be a step towards such improvement but it is also recognized that this will be a gradual and evolving process that will require conscientious participation by our external stakeholders, program staff and program managers.

Accountability

Likewise, accountability was identified as an issue that needs to be addressed by the program redesign. Accountability can be the responsibility of an individual or a group and it is focused on whether they are conducting their work activities in a manner that leads to success. It means taking responsibility for commitments, actively managing workload, supporting co-workers, reporting successes and acknowledging areas that need to be addressed further. This philosophy of accountability is already undergoing discussion at the Air and Waste Division level, as outlined in Appendix G. Once changes have been made, it is important for stakeholders, both internal and external, to accept that the situation has been resolved. The performance measures provided in this document will help the program leadership team assess the progress and success in meeting the goals of the redesign effort. These performance measures will be revised as necessary and at the appropriate time will be added to the existing list of measures already used to assess the program's operation.

Specific recommendations for improvements in our business functions are highlighted in the following discussions.

Plan Review and Licensing

Most of the recommended changes in terms of the plan review and licensing functions relate to streamlining both internal and external processes and implementing innovative regulatory alternatives as opposed to traditional facility licensing and oversight. A major recommendation involves an improvement in our technical review process for certain solid waste facilities. The revised process, described in greater detail below, will help to ensure consistency in decision-making, improve timeliness of our reviews and more fairly distribute workload across all work units.

Key future management systems changes that will improve plan review processes include:
- application of Green Tier to hazardous waste facilities,
- designation of a limited number of staff to specialize in hazardous waste facility licensing statewide,
- continuation of the currently ongoing solid waste streamlining process, and
- application of the Environmental Results Program (ERP) or self-certification processes for non-complex solid waste facilities, including transfer stations, compost sites, and other low hazard facilities.

Internal and external stakeholders offered significant input regarding the existing procedures for solid waste plan review, particularly as it applies to landfills. Review of the input revealed the following:

1. A number of staff continue to have strong concerns over the existing solid waste plan review procedures. These concerns range from maintaining solid waste plan review consistency to keeping current with state-of-the-art landfill engineering designs.
2. The current solid waste plan review system does not allow for workload balancing across regional boundaries. The current system does not allow staff expertise to be matched with incoming plan reviews.
3. Consistency, efficiency, and expertise of those staff performing solid waste plan review needs to improve.

As a result, changes are proposed for plan review relating to licensed landfills, intermediate-sized construction and demolition waste landfills, municipal solid waste combustors, and incinerators. A group of approximately 8 hydrogeologists and 8 engineers will be designated to perform all plan review and inspections for these types of facilities. In addition, one hydrogeologist and one engineer will be designated as technical plan review "experts".

For the facility types listed, the experts will work in collaboration with the regional supervisors to track and assign plan review work throughout the state. Plan review documents will continue to be submitted to the regional offices and regional supervisors will retain primary ability to assign plan review activity to their staff. Collaboration and communication with the experts will help to balance workload across the regions and will also make it easier to assign review of certain types of facilities to specific staff that may have unique expertise in that area, regardless of their geographic location. The experts will also review drafts of siting-related and precedent setting approvals and will serve as a technical resource for the plan review staff and the regional supervisors. This process will, in the long run, provide for greater efficiency and ensure that our plan approvals are more consistent and technically sound.

Hydrogeologists and engineers not in the group above, and all waste management specialists will receive important program assignments involving other facility types as well as activities beyond plan review, including evaluating closed engineered and unengineered landfills. Work will also include development and implementation of self certification programs and beyond compliance work.

Through these recommendations, the program will be able to apply its limited staff resources to those facilities and activities that present the greatest environmental threat and our overall level of service to all facilities will be enhanced. In addition, by encouraging full participation in Green Tier, the program will build trust with stakeholders while also achieving a higher level of environmental performance from those facilities.

Inspections, Audits and Program Evaluations

Similar to the future management systems for plan review/licensing the recommendations in relation to inspections/audits/program evaluations, the redesign recommendations also include specific suggestions to help streamline processes, implement Green Tier and also use information technology more effectively. Continued inspections at regulated facilities are needed. However, the program can do a better job of directing resources to maximize effectiveness in improving environmental performance. An example of this is the recommendation to focus inspection efforts on small and very small quantity generators of hazardous waste. A number of recommendations incorporate the concepts of self-inspection and self-reporting particularly for those facilities that are eligible for self-certification. Department staff will conduct focused inspections to evaluate program success and verify sector compliance and also in response to complaints. However, the frequency of inspections will be less than at present, which again, will allow staff to focus on the more complex or environmentally significant facilities and free some resources to work on other high priority activities related to innovation, outreach, partnerships, and going beyond compliance.

The program can also make better use of technology to enhance inspection/audit/program evaluation functions. Specific recommendations include encouraging electronic submittal of inspection results and annual reports, maintaining on-line resources for staff and facilities to conduct inspections and providing staff with notebook computers for use in the field.

Finally, suggestions to drop or phase out certain program activities are included, in particular, RU program evaluations for recycling facilities and department oversight of the nonmetallic mining reclamation program. Each of these programs involves substantial participation by local units of government plus an added layer of regulation by the Department. Continued Department oversight and evaluation will eventually reach a point where these do not effect substantial improvements in compliance or environmental performance. Staff can then work on other high priority activities within the program including efforts to support our "Zero Waste" vision.

Policy Development

As part of its Environmental Management System, the Waste Management Program has developed a template to direct future policy development. The future management system will formally adopt that template to help direct the program in future policy and guidance development activities. Continued experience with the EMS approach should result in increased efficiency in the application of the process.

Two major policy development efforts are identified. First, a comprehensive evaluation of the recycling program is necessary. The first recommendation is to convene a "Blue Ribbon Task Force" to conduct this evaluation and also to develop future policy to support the "Zero Waste" vision. Specific needs include additional means to promote reuse and recycling, product stewardship initiatives, shared responsibility with manufacturers, enhanced enforcement provisions and revisions to the grant program. Also proposed is a similar approach in regard to evaluation of the out-of-state waste issue, solid waste fees and landfill capacity. Each of these initiatives is critical to the success of the program in terms of moving towards its vision of "Zero Waste".

Other specific policy needs are identified that will be necessary to implement some of the recommended changes in management systems. These would include policy changes to facilitate aspects of the Green Tier activities, use of EMS in lieu of formal licensing processes at certain hazardous waste facilities and changes in the nonmetallic mining reclamation program.

Outreach & Education

In order to make positive progress towards achieving its long-range goals, the program will need to implement a comprehensive and broad outreach and communication effort. Success of many of the innovative regulatory approaches will depend heavily on effective outreach programs, and promulgation of the needed policy initiatives will not be achievable without substantial outreach efforts in combination with acceptance and participation by all of our stakeholders.

The proposed future management systems reflect the need for increased outreach efforts by recommending that the program develop a comprehensive outreach plan and commit the necessary resources to adequately implement the plan. An important element of that plan will be preparation and widespread distribution of an annual report for the program that will highlight significant developments, program successes and trends and ultimately assess our progress in moving towards "Zero Waste". The plan can also take full advantage of various opportunities to work cooperatively with internal and external stakeholders to enhance the effectiveness of the program through research, policy development, training and development of innovative practices. One particular opportunity is formation of a stakeholder group similar to the existing Brownfields Study Group associated with the Department's Remediation and Redevelopment program. Input and collaboration from a diverse group of stakeholders can help the program and its stakeholders to better understand each other's needs related to all aspects of waste and material management and can assist the program achieve its vision and successfully implement the recommended management systems.

Enforcement

The recommended future management system includes enhancements to our current enforcement process that would allow for limited authority to issue citations for violations at regulated facilities and also stresses prioritization of enforcement actions based on the waste hierarchy. Specifically, in order to help us move toward "Zero Waste" we must do more to ensure that waste reduction, reuse and recovery are maximized. An increased focus on compliance and enforcement is one mechanism that will help in achieving the goal. Implementation of a

limited citation system will reduce staff time spent on relatively minor violations yet still provide a means whereby these incidences can be addressed and corrected and will thereby allow us to focus our resources on more significant issues or facilities. Management systems related to enforcement will also need to be changed in response to proposed changes relative to licensing and regulatory oversight of various types of facilities. Appropriate enforcement procedures will need to be implemented for those facilities that are covered under the self-certification and self-monitoring systems. In addition, review and revision of the existing enforcement process as it applies to recycling facilities is needed to make the recycling enforcement provisions, and thus the overall recycling program, more effective.

Technical & Compliance Assistance

As with the other business functions, proposed improvements in terms of technical and compliance assistance revolve around greater stakeholder involvement, outreach and more effective use of information technology. Partnering with trade organizations, industries and academia will allow us to make more efficient use of our own resources. Similarly, use of the Internet to make program guidance and other important information more accessible will also lead to more effective and efficient program implementation. One additional recommendation includes limiting the areas of responsibility for program staff, especially in the regions. Specifically, staff will not be assigned more than two areas of programmatic responsibility, where at all practical. This will help to delineate clear lines of communication and responsibility and directly addresses a concern broadly expressed by program staff.

Complaint Response

The primary recommendations to improve our complaint response system will be development of a system or guidance that establishes a clear procedure for evaluating, assigning, tracking, and responding to complaints. The system will strive to maximize the use of information technology tools to the extent possible and will also stress the need for cooperation between programs. Implementation of the complaint response system can save staff time and provide for better management, timeliness and consistency in our handling of complaints.

Data Use and Management

Widespread opportunities exist to improve overall program management and implementation through better use of information technology tools and systems. The future management systems will use information technology and data to help us set program priorities, evaluate program effectiveness, allocate program resources and provide better customer service. Specific recommendations include a shift towards electronic submittal of data and reports, enhanced use of the Internet to facilitate reporting and dissemination of important program resources, and better integration of our information systems with similar systems used by other governmental units. Ultimately, use of the current on-going data model effort and the recommended changes will help to ensure that the program's data systems actually generate the type and form of information that is truly needed for effective program implementation and that program staff have the resources and technical support to effectively use these systems.

Appendix G: Draft Division Accountability Document

Several tools play critical roles in the delivery of the Air, Waste, and Remediation & Redevelopment Programs. These include:

- **setting goals and determining strategies**
- **planning our work**
- **measuring our performance**
- **evaluating our programs**
- **holding ourselves accountable for results**
- **recognizing accomplishments**

Each person in the Air, Waste, and Remediation Programs is responsible for helping ensure the success of these programs. By working together, we will achieve the important mission we are entrusted with. That means not only taking individual responsibility for our commitments, actively managing our work, supporting our co-workers and partners, and reporting on our successes, but also willingly acknowledging areas where there is "unfinished business."

We call this "proactive management."

Only by building on successes, acknowledging deficiencies, and working together to correct them, will we be able to make the environmental progress expected by the citizens of Wisconsin.

Work planning is an essential step to help us proactively manage and achieve our goals. In the spring of 2001, the Air & Waste Division expanded the work planning system to include preparation of a work plan for each Division employee. However, many people are asking what the implications are for them. In addition, some supervisors are not sure they have the tools they need to monitor individual work plans. This summary document will attempt to answer these concerns.

(The full set of principles is contained in the document, "Performance Measures, Program Management, Program Evaluation and Accountability," which is available on the Air & Waste Division's Intranet site.)

Principles of Proactive Management.

Accepting Department goals.
Managers and staff have a responsibility to accept the goals and strategies that have been developed by the Department and for supporting them through their words and actions as DNR employees.

Meeting work commitments.
All Air & Waste Division employees (staff, supervisors, and managers) are expected to meet their individual work commitments. Work units will take seriously their work plan obligations and, if needed, take appropriate steps to ensure that they make necessary changes to meet their obligations.

This means that everyone is expected to "proactively" manage their work. If a problem develops that makes it difficult to meet work commitments, employees are obligated to contact their supervisor as soon as they are aware of the difficulty.

Everyone in the Air & Waste Division is responsible for using the Performance Measures criteria established for completing an activity and for reporting honestly on the number of activities they completed. To do otherwise will undermine the credibility of performance measures and will seriously affect our ability to successfully manage our programs.

Identifying solutions to obstacles.
Each employee also has a responsibility to work with their supervisor to expeditiously find potential ways to deal with identified problems and to implement solutions, approved by their supervisor, in a timely manner. If employees do all of these in a manner that demonstrates respect and understanding for others, they have met their obligation to their work commitments, regardless of whether the "numbers" actually meet the targets. The Air & Waste Management Team commits itself to following through with work units and individuals that do not meet their obligations.

AWMT to work more closely with supervisors.
The Air & Waste Management Team (AWMT) will make it a priority to allocate time to Division supervisors to work more closely with their staff. This will be recognized in the work plans and performance objectives of individual supervisors. AWMT will be sensitive to the workloads of supervisors and the priorities placed on them.

- **To ensure that supervisors will continue to have adequate time to work with their staff, AWMT and the three Program Management Teams (AMT, RRMT, and WAMT) will take into account the workload implications for supervisors before commissioning any new "projects."**

Accountability at every level.
The Air & Waste Management Team is committed to ensuring that accountability for work commitments occurs at all levels. All Division employees should look to this system of accountability as a means to help them remove barriers and solve problems which keep them from accomplishing their work.

Recognizing accomplishments.
The Air & Waste Management Team commits the Division to a system of recognizing the accomplishments of individuals and work units that proactively manage their activities to meet their commitments.

Appendix H: Bureau Structure Recommendations

Bureau of Waste and Materials Management	p. 1/3

Business Unit:	Purpose Statement:
Business Support and Information Technology Section	• Promote widespread use of technology and optimal use of data to help achieve a goal of zero waste. • Coordinate regular performance measures assessment and reporting • Manage both the Inter and Intra net sites • Manage the Program's Budget and Work Planning Activities • Track implementation of Green Tier activities in the program • Coordinate development of publications

Scope of Services:
- Develop all performance measures for the program and assure alignment with division and dept goals
- Develop and maintain inter and intra net pages
- Develop GIS functionality in program
- Develop and manage integrated data systems and document management
- Provide comprehensive data management plan
- Provide technical IT assistance to program staff
- Assist managers with developing performance measures
- Small Business assistance and outreach
- Coordinate regular assessment and reporting of performance
- Assist managers with developing information technology plans
- Manage grant accounts and program budget
- Manage work planning and budget-related activities
- Provide clerical support to bureau
- Track "Beyond Compliance" (Green Tier, etc) initiatives in the program
- Coordinate development of and edit program publications and major outreach efforts (Communication Plan)

Key Processes:
- Data analysis, integration and management
- Web development based on needs of business units
- Work Planning
- Budget Management
- Performance measures/reporting
- Owner Financial Responsibility
- Outreach and Marketing skills
- Editing
-

Roles & Responsibilities:	Staffing Guidelines (minimum):
• Work with sections and WaMT to develop performance measures • Develop and oversee bureau web pages • Work with sections to establish integrated data systems	•

Skills:
- IT web skills
- Data base management skills
- Knowledge of setting and using Performance measures
- Budget and work planning
- "Beyond Compliance" (e.g. Green Tier) concepts
- Publications/editing skills
- Strategic thinking and articulation
- Advocacy
- Knowledge of Owner Financial Responsibility procedures

Business Unit:
Hazardous Waste Prevention and Management Section

Purpose Statement:
- Manage for effective, consistent implementation of the Hazardous Waste, Special Waste and Mining programs throughout the state
- Manage or provide for innovative tools to ensure compliance or 'beyond compliance'
- Establish those standards and policies needed to manage towards a vision of Zero Waste

Scope of Services:
- Develop all policy, rules, and guidance pertaining to hazardous waste, special waste and mining
- Develop and implement public outreach activities to support hazardous waste, special waste and mining policies and initiatives
- Coordinate hazardous waste facility plan review and licensing
- Provide technical assistance and direction to program staff and stakeholders implementing the hazardous waste, special waste and mining programs
- Work with stakeholders to establish "beyond compliance" innovative initiatives, technologies and strategies to move toward the goal of zero waste
- Coordinate regulatory oversight of metallic mining activities
- Assist managers with developing training plans for staff
- Arrange for core staff training

Key Processes:
Develop/support key program processes
- Beyond Compliance innovative approaches
- Technical Plan Review
- Planning and Policy Development
- Outreach
- Technical Assistance
- Environmental Monitoring
- Inspections
- Compliance Assistance and Complaint Response
- Enforcement
- Point of contact with EPA on Hazardous Waste and Special Waste programs

Roles & Responsibilities:
- Identify innovative improvement opportunities
- Evaluate consistency and timeliness of reviews
- Set and coordinate overall direction of the hazardous waste, special waste and mining programs
- EPA contact for hazardous/special waste program
- Provide mentoring opportunities with staff
- Work with regional staff to assure effective implementation of the hazardous waste, special waste and mining programs

Staffing Guidelines (minimum):
-

Skills:
- Technical experts in hazardous waste, special waste and mining
- Planning and Policy Development
- Rule writing
- Good communication skills and collaboration skills
- Outreach Expertise
- Plan Review Experts
- Broad knowledge of social and economic issues
- Strategic thinking
- Advocacy
- Knowledge of enforcement procedures and practices
-

Business Unit:	Purpose Statement:
Recycling & Solid Waste Management Section	• Manage for effective, consistent implementation of the recycling and solid waste programs throughout the state • Manage or provide for innovative tools to ensure compliance or "beyond compliance" • Extablish those standards and policies needed to manage towards Zero Waste

Scope of Services:
- Develop all policy, rules, and guidance pertaining to solid waste and recycling
- Develop and implement public outreach activities to support solid waste and recycling policies and initiatives
- Coordinate solid waste facility plan review and licensing
- Provide technical assistance and direction to program staff and stakeholders implementing the solid waste and recycling programs
- Work with stakeholders to establish "beyond compliance" innovative initiatives, technologies and strategies to move toward the goal of zero waste
- Assist managers with developing training plans for staff
- Arrange for core staff training

Key Processes:
Develop/support key program processes
- Beyond compliance innovative approaches
- Technical Plan Review
- Planning and Policy Development
- Beneficial Reuse approaches and approvals
- Outreach
- Technical Assistance
- Environmental Monitoring
- Inspections
- Compliance Assistance and Complaint Response
- Enforcement
- Point of contact with EPA on the Recycling and Solid Waste programs

Roles & Responsibilities:	Staffing Guidelines (minimum):
• Identify innovative improvement opportunities • Set and coordinate overall direction of the solid waste and recycling programs • Evaluate consistency and timeliness of reviews • EPA contact on recycling and solid waste programs • Work with regional staff to assure effective implementation of the solid waste and recycling programs • Provide mentoring opportunities with staff	•

Skills:
- Technical experts in solid waste, beneficial reuse and recycling
- Planning and Policy Development
- Rule Writing
- Good communication skills and collaboration skills
- Outreach Expertise
- Plan Review Experts
- Broad knowledge of social and economic issues
- Strategic thinking
- Advocacy
- Knowledge of enforcement procedures and practices

Business Unit Interdependencies:
- Rely on the Information Technology & Business Services (ITBS) Section for IT needs and support
- Rely on the ITBS Section for Web and publications support
- Work with the ITBS Section for purposes of budget, work planning, and performance reporting

Appendix I: Program Redesign Implementation Plan

	Waste Management Program Redesign Implementation Plan		
Themes	**Near term (year 1)**	**Medium Term (years 1-3)**	**Long term (years 3-5)**
Organizational Structure	Implement program structure.	Address division level issues if significant reductions in funding occur.	Check-in. Is redesign working?
	Identify designated staff for complex plan review and HW licensing.	Is organizational structure in place?	
	Get HR business done-PDs, etc.	Evaluate and adjust program redesign.	
	Identify financial barriers to implementing redesign.		
	Address team status and needs.	Conduct staff training and do gap analysis.	
Beyond Compliance	Continue ongoing HW licensing/EMS pilot.	Change codes and get EPA involvement related to Green Tier and beyond compliance.	Implement company wide approvals.
	Get sector charters in place for WISRI, developers and printers.	Conduct staff training.	18 TSDs doing either EMS or Green Tier
	Develop program wide goals for beyond compliance.	Form pilots to broaden implementation of GT and BC	Implement materials management/waste hierarchy.
		Develop strategies and begin implementation of waste hierarchy and materials management in decision making.	
Streamlining	Continue work on plan review streamlining rules and guidance.	Develop ERP self-certification program.	Evaluate county implementation of NMM program and begin statutory changes to sunset.
		Conduct targeted inspections (HW and SW).	
		Develop and implement self-auditing procedures.	
		Consolidate NMM audit process and other program functions.	
		Build greater efficiency into the recycling program.	
		Streamline enforcement strategies (citation/process).	
Communication and Stakeholder Involvement	Define program decision making model.	Develop comprehensive outreach plan/begin implementation.	Continue implementation of comprehensive outreach plan.
	Define policy development procedure=clear and inclusive.	Post Waste Management Program Annual Report on the WEB.	Evaluate and adapt all communication plans.
	Continue open burning initiative.	Develop comprehensive plan for technical assistance.	Report on redesign implementation.
	Develop strategies for ongoing stakeholder involvement: internals and externals.	Address financial stability issues with stakeholders.	Check-in on program redesign (similar to R&R group).
	Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Waste Capacity Fees & Out-of-State Waste	Survey stakeholders on timely and consistent issues.	
	Develop working relationship with legislator(s).	Get stakeholder group up and running.	
IT	Define staffing and fiscal needs.	Develop and implement system for on-line self-certification.	Electronic submittal plan reviews and GEMS.
	Develop and implement sortable guidance system.	Develop and implement automated checklists and inspection forms.	Develop electronic file system.
	Post plan approvals on WEB.	Implement mid-term data model recommendations.	Consolidate DNR Waste Management Program systems with EPA.
	Continue conceptual data management model work.	Begin budget initiative preparation.	Begin integrating WMP data management systems.
	Get GEMS on the WEB.	Develop and implement automated on-line complaint system.	
		Start automated submittal for GEMS.	
		Start electronic submittal for plan approvals.	
21-Jan-2005			

Appendix J: Program Redesign Implementation Worksheets

Appendix	**Implementation Activity**
J-2	Implement program structure and operations
J-5	Program Structure and Operations Implementation: Sub-group to identify the specific staff to conduct plan review and how plan review work is conducted in the program
J-7	Define broad program decision making process that addresses issues defined in sideboards (see below).
J-9	APPROVALS on the WEB - Allow access to solid waste plan approvals through the Internet
J-11	Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Waste Capacity, Fees and Out of state waste
J-13	Continue Hazardous Waste Licensing EMS pilot with S.C. Johnson
J-15	Sector Charter
J-17	Rule Revisions Regarding Streamlining of Solid Waste Sub-Program
J-18	Continue open burning initiative
J-20	Sortable Guidance - Improve access to existing and future guidance documents.
J-22	GEMS and SHWIMS on the WEB
J-24	Conceptual Data Model - Capture all of the modeled activities, on-going and planned, that involve data gathering, utilization processes, and their relationship to each other.
J-26	Develop strategies for ongoing stakeholder involvement: internal and external.
J-28	Waste Program Goals for Beyond Compliance
J-30	Develop working relationship with legislator(s)
J-32	Define policy development procedure – clear and inclusive.
J-34	Define staffing and fiscal needs.

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Organizational Structure

Activity: Implement program structure and operations

Charge:

- Using the bureau and region structure changes in the Redesign Report, develop a detailed plan for the program, with the necessary skill sets, individual position duties, responsibilities, and reporting relationships.
- Propose resource allocations and conceptual staffing (1. What is needed; and 2. What is practical under present staffing (83.5 FTE).
    - Plan for and implement the recommended structural changes in a manner that supports and incorporates the management systems recommended– in the WMPR report.
        - o Sub-groups are needed to develop how the plan review work will be conducted, and how teams will be used in the program. See the worksheet for the plan review sub-group.
        - o Provide a mechanism to do the work that was previously done by the program-based standing teams. Phase implementation as necessary for a smooth transition.
        - o Identify cross-program standing teams needed, such as communication, IT, training, and environmental monitoring.
    - Recommend change mechanisms to ease the transition.
    - Involve stakeholder input to this effort.

Sideboards:

- Strive to minimize staff reassignment and dislocation.
- Develop proposals with HR considerations in mind.
- Teams will no longer exist as they do now. Because the Bureau is organized along program lines, the sections, their staff and experienced Region staff will be responsible for the work of the current program-based teams.
- While the transition occurs, teams should continue to operate as they do now.
- Proposals maintain the positive relationships that exist presently in the program-based teams.
- Plan review work is done with limited staff, and completed in a manner that ensures consistency and timeliness.
- Seek input from stakeholders on this effort.

How to get the job done-person or work group-leadership:

- Form a work group to do this work.
    - Use sub-groups as needed (plan review, standing teams needed in the program, etc)

- Assign Leadership from the WaMT.
- Reference the Air Management Re-deployment effort to learn from their experience.
- Involve Human Resources to assist in this effort.

Necessary steps:

- Develop a detailed timeline and project plan (necessary steps, milestones, specific products).
- Seek clarification from Team Sponsor or the WaMT immediately and throughout the project, as needed.
- Create sub-groups as necessary to complete all of this work (see worksheet on sub-group for plan review)
- Conceptualize work unit structures including staff and management relationships.
- Determine how Region staff will participate in the new program-based structure.
- Determine how staff (region and bureau) will be accountable within the new structure and operations.
- Identify skill sets.
- Identify resource needs.
- Identify classifications.
- Involve HR/understand HR and union guidelines/constraints.
- Identify needed standing teams.
- Identify how work within the program is accomplished (teams, relationships, communication)
- Develop written proposal.
- Develop PDs
- Develop plan for staff transition
- Implement plan
- Identify change needs and develop a plan to address those in the transition.

Timeline:

- First draft of the plan to change the program structure and operations - April 15, 2005
- Second draft of the plan to change the program structure and operations - June 1, 2005.
- Begin implementation no later than July 1, 2005.

Skill sets:

- Active, engaged Team members
- Management (regional leader, section chief, bureau director)
- Staff (hydro, engineer, specialist)
- Standing Team Leader knowledge (how the teams operate currently)
- Communication skills
- Human Resources knowledge
- Knowledge of managing change and transitions

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- 2 – 3 managers for 200 hours each
- 3 – 5 staff (hydro, engineer, specialist) for 200 hours each
- Team Leader for 200 hours
- Human Resources person

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- Sub-groups are coordinated
- Human Resources

- Unions
- Division Administrator

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Organization Structure

Activity: Program Structure and Operations Implementation: Sub-group to identify the specific staff to conduct plan review and how plan review work is conducted in the program

Charge:

- To determine the specific, limited staff who will conduct specific solid waste facility plan review in the program;
- To determine the staff who will complete the hazardous waste plan review and re-licensing.
- To determine how other work that is plan review and not included in the specific work listed above, is completed.
- To develop a transition plan to assign staff.
- To define how the plan review/relicensing work will be conducted amongst all the staff and managers involved (experts, precedent setting and unusual issues guidance, etc).
- Seek input from stakeholders in this effort.

Sideboards:

- Use the Redesign team recommendations to determine the limited staff assigned to these activities:
  - 2 for HW licensing
  - ~8 engineers and ~8 hydros in the specified solid waste plan review group (these numbers were developed through conversations with managers in the program. They need to be verified through this effort)
  - Consider locations of affected facilities and work stations of existing plan review and re-licensing staff in making resource assignments
  - Prepare guidelines for activities to be conducted by staff not selected for this specific work
- Report to and coordinate with, the Program Structure and Operations Implementation work group on the Human Resources issues and timing and project status

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- Form small work group
- Leaders from the WaMT

Necessary steps:

- Develop a detailed timeline and project plan (necessary steps, milestones, specific products).
- Seek clarification from Team Sponsor or the WaMT immediately and throughout the project, as needed.
- Define exact number needed for the solid waste plan review utilizing available information on time usage, number of facilities and facility locations.
- Determine best locations for staffing for both HW and SW
- Develop skill sets and criteria for plan review and re-licensing work
- Develop PDs
- Develop transition plan for staffing
- Coordinate with the Program Structure work group

Timeline:

- First Draft will be part of the overall plan for program structure changes due to the WaMT on April 15, 2005
- Second Draft will be part of the overall plan for program structure changes due to the WaMT on June 1, 2005
- Begin implementation by July 1, 2005

Skill sets:

- Management (regional leader, section chief
- Staff (engineer, hydrogeologist, specialist)
- Human Resources knowledge

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- 2 managers for 100 hours each
- 3 staff for 100 hours each
- Human Resources person for 100 hours

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- Human Resources
- Unions
- Division Administrator

<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 10px;">

General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations

- WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
- WaMT approves Work Group.
- The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
- WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
- WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

</div>

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Communication and Stakeholder Involvement

Activity: Define broad program decision making process that addresses issues defined in sideboards (see below).

Charge:

- Develop and define a decision making process for the waste and materials management program that integrates streamlined decision making and trust, and encourages risk-taking for purposes of achieving greater environmental gains. (Examples of decisions to be considered would be policy decisions, plan review decisions, issues related to precedent setting requests)
- Bring back to Redesign team for check-in to determine if proposed system addresses issues brought out during redesign input.

Sideboards:

- Must take into consideration new/proposed program structure and management systems.
- Authority for decisions to be made at the lowest applicable level.
- Consider issues of trust in professional opinions vs. authorities required for long term issues of enforcement.
- Clear lines of authority and responsibility.
- System of checks and balances to ensure system is working effectively including authorities for corrections.
- Review with current decision making policies including signature authorities, conflict resolution, acceptable decision models (consensus, substantial agreement, voting, etc.), and any other applicable documents utilized within the program.
- Encourages movement toward risk-taking, reduction of command and control, and movement toward green tier type activities.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- WaMT assign subteam to do development (one regional mgr, one central office mgr, and ability to assign additional members if needed).
- Include at least one member from Program Redesign Team.
- Assign sponsor

Necessary steps:

- Review current decision making authorities and determine where hold ups may be and where streamlining could be done.
- Make modifications to current authorities to correct findings.

- ➢ Submit final document to WaMTfor concurrence.
- ➢ WaMT compares actual decision making to new guidelines on a regular basis and makes corrections to practice and/or guidelines as needed.

Timeline:

- ➢ Form sub-team to begin work drafting changes by April 15, 2005 after second draft report is completed by program structure implementation team (this is based on the need for the modifications to be based on the new structure). Initial work of putting together reference material could be done prior to this time.
- ➢ First draft May 6, 2005
- ➢ Final document June 1, 2005

Skillsets:

- ➢ Regional and central office management (2 or 3 people)
- ➢ One team leader (to be determined by WaMT)
- ➢ One or two staff (to be determined by WaMT)

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- ➢ Research - 2-4 hours per team member
- ➢ Development -   10 hours per team member
- ➢ Final Document -   2-4 hours per team member

Dependencies- other programs, etc.

- ➢ None evident.

> **General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations**
>
> - WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
> - WaMT approves Work Group.
> - The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
> - WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
> - WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Information Technology

Activity: APPROVALS on the WEB - Allow access to solid waste plan approvals through the Internet

Charge:

- ➢ Place all solid waste plan approvals on the web, without consolidation.
- ➢ Determine the technical steps necessary to allow access to solid waste plan approvals through the Intranet.
- ➢ Move applications to Internet when technically feasible.
- ➢ Include external partners in the planning and design of this site.
- ➢ Prepare fiscal report for implementation and maintenance of solid waste plan approvals on the Web.
- ➢ Secure appropriate approvals to allow placement of solid waste plan approvals on the Internet (BTS).
- ➢ Implement action plan and place solid waste plan approvals on the web for internal access by July 1, 2006.
- ➢ Implement action plan and place solid waste plan approvals on the web for external access by July 1, 2007.

Sideboards:

- ➢ Ensure that addition of program approvals will meet State and Department web standards.
- ➢ Operate within Program budget constraints.
- ➢ Develop procedures to ensure that the web site is maintained on a regular basis (monthly preferred, but quarterly at a minimum).
- ➢ Determine how customers will be notified of the increased availability of this database.
- ➢ Include externals in all phases of this project.
- ➢ Set up mechanisms to assist customers who have access or other questions.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- ➢ Program Services Section will have the lead in implementing this project.
- ➢ Assigned to IT specialist for implementation.
- ➢ Periodic progress reports presented to Bureau Director and WaMT.

Necessary steps:

- ➢ Program Services Section Chief will develop.

Timeline:

- ➢ Project directed to the Program Services Section by July 1, 2005.
- ➢ Implementation plan and necessary approvals in-place by December 31, 2005.

Skillsets:

➢ Supervisory oversight.
➢ IT technical expertise.

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

➢ To be developed by Program Services Section Chief and assigned staff member.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.

➢ None evident.

General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations

- WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
- WaMT approves Work Group.
- The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
- WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
- WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Communication and Stakeholder Involvement

Activity: Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Waste Capacity, Fees and Out of state waste

Charge:

- Wisconsin's recycling program continues to be a huge success. Each year, we divert from our landfills over 40% of our municipal and yard waste, over 70% of our utility ash, and 60% of Wisconsin's foundry sand and pulp and paper sludge. Even with this success, approximately 10 Million Tons of municipal and industrial waste was placed in Wisconsin's landfills last year. Of this almost 15% was from out-of-state. In order to build upon the successes of the recycling program, ensure that we are not "wasting resources" and address adequately our need for land disposal capacity, Wisconsin must define a long-term vision of waste materials management, recycling and solid waste disposal.
- Governor creates and appoints a Blue Ribbon Task Force OR the Secretary appoints an advisory body to study this issue and make recommendations.
- Waste Materials and Management Program staffs the task force/advisory body.

Sideboards:

- Build upon the "Zero Waste" vision created with stakeholders in 2002.
- Examine Statutory changes that may assist in improving environmental benefit.
- Consider activities being undertaken in other states and other countries.
- Complete work within 6 months following appointments.

How to get the job done-person or work group-leadership:

- Governor appointed or Secretary appointed body from diverse interests in waste and materials management in Wisconsin.
- 2 – 3 people from the Waste and Materials Management Program.

Necessary steps:

- Define specific stakeholders to participate.
- Appoint/Invite stakeholders to participate.
- Develop a detailed timeline and project plan (necessary steps, milestones, specific products).
- Seek clarification from Division Administrator or Secretary's or Governor's office immediately and throughout the project, as needed.
- Conduct regular meetings, complete homework between meetings.

- Develop report.
- Report out to Governor/Secretary.

Timeline:

- Determine Group by July 15, 2005
- Appoint members by August 15, 2005
- Initiate meetings by September 15, 2005
- Draft report by January 30, 2006
- Seek stakeholder input
- Finalize report by March 30, 2006

Skill sets:

- Creative thinking
- Collaboration
- Communication
- Policy making
- Knowledge of waste management issues

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- 2 - 3 people (management, staff) – 150 hours each
- Paul Heinen
- External stakeholders (10)

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- Secretary's Office
- Legal
- Division Administrator

> **General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations**
>
> - WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
> - WaMT approves Work Group.
> - The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
> - WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
> - WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Beyond Compliance

Activity: Continue Hazardous Waste Licensing EMS pilot with S.C. Johnson

Charge:

- Link EMS capabilities and HW license requirements for the Waxdale facility to produce a performance based process.
- Replacing the traditional RCRA permit with an EMS permit at S.C.Johnson
- Develop a template to replicate the EMS permitting process

Sideboards:

- Involve EPA throughout the effort

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- WDNR
     Christine Lilek
     Mike Ellenbecker
     Frank Schultz (leader)
     Sue Bangert (bureau contact)
     Tom Eggert
- Region 5
     Todd Ramaly
     John G
- S.C. Johnson

Necessary steps:

- Identify and verify WDNR, Region 5 and S.C. Johnson leads and participants, resource needs, and schedule for this effort.
- Develop an understanding of the S.C. Johnson (Waxdale) manufacturing processes and Environmental Management System (EMS) that are in place.
- Identify RCRA license requirements and identify areas of potential RCRA concerns (like legal issues) with using an EMS.
- Compare S.C. Johnson EMS with the RCRA license process to define areas of consistency and exclusion.

- S.C. Johnson, EPA and WDNR will work collaboratively to develop adjustments to the EMS or other procedures to address the RCRA requirements with transparency, efficiency, understanding, environmental protection and sustainability being guiding principles in developing these other procedures. If an impasses occurs, in developing these procedures, Frank Schultz, SER Waste Management Team Supervisor, in consultation with Paul Little (EPA, Region 5) and a representative of S.C. Johnson will make the decision(s) to keep the project on track. If it can not be resolved at this level, then Sue Bangert, Bureau Director, will have conversations with S.C. Johnson and/or the Division Administrator, Waste, Pesticides and Toxics, EPA Region V.
- Develop and implement an expanded or modified EMS at S.C. Johnson to replace their HW license. Evaluate the use of a contract to give legal instrument to give standing to the EMS in lieu of the formal, traditional permit document.
- Develop a report on the process (overview) of using an EMS to address RCRA permitting, what worked and what didn't work, and limiting factors. The report needs to be completed by December 31, 2005.

Timeline:

- Complete the grant by March, 2006
- Issue the EMS license

Skill sets:

- Sponsor
- Regional Supervisor
- Waste Management Specialists

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- Sponsor – 40 hours, FY05, FY06
- Regional Leader – 100 hours (05/06)
- Mike and Christine – 700 hours each (05/06)
- Grant funding for this project

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- Cooperative Environmental Assistance
- EPA

General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations

- WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
- WaMT approves Work Group.
- The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
- WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
- WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

---

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Beyond Compliance

Activity: Sector Charter

Charge:

- To participate in and contribute to a successful sector charter for the Wisconsin Scrap Recycling Industries Charter and a Development Council Charter.
- To represent waste and materials management issues in the charter discussions to include zero waste.
- To identify issues that can contribute to development of waste program goals related to charter use in the program.

Sideboards:

- Creative thinking to promote environmental protection beyond current program standards.
- Problem solving to reach successful conclusion.

How to get the job done-person or work group-leadership:

- Designate 2 people in program as the charter contacts/participants (WA will not be the lead person in either of these charter discussions)
- Consult with the WaMT on progress
- Consult on program policy issues

Necessary steps:

- Participate in meetings with sector to discuss goals for charter and language
- Check with program on policy issues associated with charter
- Review draft charter language
- Inform WaMT of the discussions and issues raised

Timeline:

- Complete Development Council Charter by August, 2005.
- Complete WISRI Charter by….

Skill sets:

- Manager or staff
- Collaboration and negotiation skills
- Participation and communication skills
- Beyond Compliance/Green Tier knowledge

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- Mike Degen (WISRI) – 60 hours
- Sue Bangert (or other volunteer) (Development Council) – 60 hours
- WaMT members – varying – 20 hours apiece
- Dan Graff – 40 hours
- Cooperative Environmental Assistance staff

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- Cooperative Environmental Assistance
- Legal
- Water

<div style="border: 1px solid black; background: #d3d3d3; padding: 10px;">

General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations

- WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
- WaMT approves Work Group.
- The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
- WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
- WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

</div>

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Streamlining

Activity: Rule Revisions Regarding Streamlining of Solid Waste Sub-Program

Charge:

- Obtain Natural Resources Board adoption of proposed rules

Sideboards:

- None

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- Jack Connelly and Dennis Mack working with stakeholder group and various members of Waste Management Program staff.

Necessary steps:

- Request permission to hold hearings
- Hold hearings
- Prepare final green sheet requesting NRB adoption
- Request NRB adoption of proposed rules

Timeline:

- Calendar year 2005

Skillsets:

- Knowledge of Solid Waste Sub-Program and rule making process

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- 500 hours

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- Coordinate with Legal Services, other department programs and stakeholders.

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Communication and Stakeholder Involvement

Activity: Continue open burning initiative

Charge:

♦ Continue efforts to reduce / eliminate open burning in Wisconsin including pursuit of citation authority, education of citizens, encouragement of municipalities to utilize the materials developed including the model ordinance.

Sideboards:

♦ Work should continue as currently outlined.
♦ Coordinate with efforts to develop better working relationships with legislator(s).

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

♦ Continue coordinated work with Kevin Kessler.
♦ Continue assignments as currently set.

Necessary steps:

♦ Provide clear information to all staff regarding who is organizing efforts, materials available, and expectations regarding topic.
♦ Set up system to coordinate efforts to educate legislators regarding problems not only with open burning but other waste issues.
♦ Ensure appropriate staff are assigned to assist Kevin with these efforts and time is allotted for this effort.

Timeline:

♦ Communication system in place by May 1, 2005.

Skillsets:

♦ Management (will be dependent on program structure modifications).
♦ Writing/editing skills – to assist in development of outreach tools as needed.
♦ Outreach and good communication skills – to work with legislators.

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

♦ Discussion needs to be held with Kevin to determine future resource needs.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

♦ Air management
♦ Forestry/fire control
♦ Law enforcement

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Information Technology

Activity: Sortable Guidance - Improve access to existing and future guidance documents.

Charge: Recommend and implement next steps with regard to accessing waste guidance documents.

Sideboards:

- Operate within project budget constraints.
- Work within parameters established by the Remediation & Redevelopment Program for similar initiative
- Meet project deadlines for interim and final reports.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- Program Services Section will be responsible for oversight of this project.
- Assess access needs of internal and external guidance users.
- Recommend enhancements to the system to meet user needs.
- Potential changes in project scope - including timelines, budgets, operations, etc. – will be directed to the Program Services Section Chief or project manager in a timely manner.
- Periodic progress reports will be presented to the WaMT by Program Services Section Chief or designee.

Necessary steps:

- Coordinate with the RR Program to take advantage of their development work on a similar project.

Timeline:

- Complete project by July 1, 2006.

Skillsets:

- Supervisory oversight.
- IT technical expertise.
- Outreach/communications tools.

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- Minimal expenditure of resources is anticipated, if RR's development efforts will fit WA needs.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.

➤ Remediation & Redevelopment Program.

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Information Technology

Activity: GEMS and SHWIMS on the WEB
Allow access to GEMS/SHWIMS database through the Internet
- Download of data by externals
- Upload of data by externals

Charge:

- ➢ Determine the technical steps necessary to allow access to the GEMS/SHWIMS database through the Internet.
- ➢ Prepare fiscal report for implementation and maintenance of GEMS/SHWIMS on the Web.
- ➢ Secure appropriate approvals to allow placement of GEMS/SHWIMS for downloads on the Internet
- ➢ Determine electronic signature protocol for certifications used when externals upload data
- ➢ Develop automated submittal and data verification processes for data upload
- ➢ Implement action plan and place GEMS on the web for downloads by July 1, 2005.
- ➢ Implement action plan and place SHWIMS on the web for downloads by July 1, 2006.
- ➢ Implement action plan and allow externals to upload their own data by December 1, 2007.

Sideboards:

- ➢ Ensure that addition of GEMS/SHWIMS will meet State and Department applications standards.
- ➢ Operate within Program budget constraints.
- ➢ Develop procedures to ensure that the web site database is updated daily and the web pages maintained on a regular basis (monthly preferred, but quarterly at a minimum).
- ➢ Determine how customers will be notified of the increased availability of this database.
- ➢ Set up mechanisms to assist customers who have access or other questions about GEMS on the Web.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- ➢ Program Services Section will have the lead in implementing this project.
- ➢ Assigned to IT specialist and GEMS subteam (if appropriate) for implementation.
- ➢ Periodic progress reports presented to Bureau Director and WaMT.

Necessary steps:

- ➢ Program Services Section Chief will develop.

Timeline:

➢ Project directed to the Program Services Section by March 1, 2005.
➢ Implementation plan and necessary approval in-place for downloads by April 1, 2005.
➢ GEMS placed on the WEB by July 1, 2005.
➢ SHWIMS placed on the WEB by July 1, 2006.
➢ GEMS/SHWIMS upload system available to externals by December 1, 2007

Skillsets:

➢ Supervisory oversight.
➢ IT technical expertise.
➢ Knowledge of GEMS/SHWIMS and the Department's data portal.
➢ Outreach/communications assistance.

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

➢ To be developed by Program Services Section Chief, Environmental Monitoring Team leader equivalent and assigned staff members.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.

➢ BTS – firewall and virus protection, access to and use of data portal
➢ Statewide electronic signature protocol

> **General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations**
>
> - WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
> - WaMT approves Work Group.
> - The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
> - WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
> - WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Information Technology

Activity: Conceptual Data Model - Capture all of the modeled activities, on-going and planned, that involve data gathering, utilization processes, and their relationship to each other.

Charge:

➢ Identify the portion of the organization and activities to be included in the model.
➢ Identify the existing business rules for those activities.
➢ Discuss the activities and the work needed with individuals at all levels in the organization, across operating locations, and with other stakeholders.
➢ Develop a summary of activities, their relationship to data, and their inter-relationships.
➢ Evaluate and modify the summary based upon comments from members of the organization.

Sideboards:

➢ Interview program staff at all levels to gain a thorough understanding of data management needs.
➢ Interview other stakeholders.
➢ Operate within project budget constraints.
➢ Meet project deadlines for interim and final reports.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

➢ Program Services Section will oversee progress and completion of Conceptual Data Management Model project.
➢ Potential changes in project scope - including timelines, budgets, operations, etc. – will be directed to the Program Services Section Chief in a timely manner.
➢ Periodic progress reports will be presented to the Program Services Section Chief and/or designee(s).

Necessary steps:

➢ Have already been developed and included in existing contract.
➢ Determine when and how the Logical and Physical data models will be completed.

Timeline:

➢ Scheduled for completion in January 2005.

Skillsets:

➢ Supervisory oversight.
➢ IT technical expertise.

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

➢ $31,000 currently budgeted for project.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.

➢ None evident.

<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 15px;">

General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations

- WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
- WaMT approves Work Group.
- The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
- WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
- WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

</div>

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Communication and Stakeholder Involvement

Activity: Develop strategies for ongoing stakeholder involvement: internal and external.

Charge:

- ❖ Develop multiple strategies that will result in increased, long-term stakeholder involvement that encompasses the various sections of the waste program.

Sideboards:

- ❖ Strategies must include both internal and external stakeholders.
- ❖ Streamlining of efforts to be considered.
- ❖ Use of IT where possible.
- ❖ Consider multJ-media.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- ❖ Form team to do this work.
- ❖ Assign sponsor.

Necessary steps:

- ❖ Determine areas where long-term stakeholder involvement is beneficial.
- ❖ Discuss development of Brownfields Stakeholder group with R&R and utilize their experience in developing stakeholder involvement for Waste.
- ❖ Develop strategy/criteria for stakeholder input including both internal and external stakeholders.
- ❖ Develop a system of checks and balances to ensure that stakeholder input is being sought, considered and utilized. System to include means of determining stakeholder satisfaction in process(s).
- ❖ Coordinate with decision making process.

Timeline:

- ❖ First draft July 15, 2005
- ❖ Final August 15, 2005
- ❖ Stakeholder group(s) developed as soon after as appropriate for issue.

Skillsets:

❖ Management (central office, regional)
❖ Staff (team leader, 2 regional staff)

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

❖ 15-20 hours per individual on development team.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

❖ Input to be sought from R&R.

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Beyond Compliance

Activity: Waste Program Goals for Beyond Compliance

Charge:

- To develop goals for Waste Management Program in accomplishing 'beyond compliance' work
- To share those goals with the WaMT for adoption
- To share goals with stakeholders (internal and external)
- To share goals with AWMT
- To begin implementation of the goals as resources allow

Sideboards:

- Think beyond the current regulations
- Examine Statutory changes that may assist in improving environmental benefit
- Consider activities being undertaken in other states and other countries

How to get the job done-person or work group-leadership:

- 3 people from the program, leader either in WaMT or staff person
- External Stakeholders – 2 – 3

Necessary steps:

- Develop a detailed timeline and project plan (necessary steps, milestones, specific products).
- Seek clarification from Team Sponsor or the WaMT immediately and throughout the project, as needed.
- Define, conceptually, what beyond compliance can mean in terms of Waste and Materials Management
- Determine potential resource needs including staff training, alternative skill sets, etc
- Seek input from stakeholders (internal and external) in goals
- Refine goals and share with stakeholders
- Finalize and develop 'roll-out' plan

Timeline:

- Draft goals to WaMT by June 1, 2005
- Final goals to WaMT by July 15, 2005

- WaMT will submit progress reports and update the list of beyond compliance goals to the AWMT on a biannual basis.

Skill sets:

- Creative thinking
- Collaboration

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- 3 people (management, staff) – 40 hours each
- External stakeholders (2 – 3)
- Cooperative Environmental Assistance staff or manager

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- Cooperative Environmental Assistance
- Legal
- Division Administrator

<div style="border: 2px solid black; background-color: #c0c0c0; padding: 10px;">

General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations

- WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
- WaMT approves Work Group.
- The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
- WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
- WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

</div>

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Communication and Stakeholder Involvement

Activity: Develop working relationship with legislator(s)

Charge:

- Determine members of the legislature that may have interests related to waste programs and develop working relationships with those members to educate them in the issues facing the program.

Sideboards:

- Limit number to 1-3 initially.
- No party preference.
-

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

- Assign work to 1-2 individuals.

Necessary steps:

- Identify members who may be interested in waste issues (possibly memo).
- Coordinate with department liaison(s).
- Coordinate with department management including Al Shea's office and potentially secretary's office.
- Develop packet of outreach material and system for sharing information with those interested.
- Talk with other programs (R&R) about their experience in developing these relationships.

Timeline:

- Initial contact by March 30, 2005.
- Efforts after should be coordinated but on-going.

Skillsets:

- Management Coordination
- Good public relation/people skills
- Good overall knowledge of the entire program, issues now facing the program, and future goals of the program.
- Editing/publications.

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- Initial contact – 3-4 hours
- Outreach / sharing efforts – 4 hours / mo.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.

- Discuss similar activity w/R&R program to get feedback on how they were able to do this successfully.

> **General Sideboards for all work groups assigned to implement redesign recommendations**
>
> - WMPR team recommends Implementation Worksheet and general Work Group membership to WaMT.
> - WaMT approves Work Group.
> - The Work Group's primary contact is the team sponsor (either a WaMT member or a member of the WMPR team).
> - WaMT provides the general direction for Work Group activities and is responsible for ensuring implementation occurs timely and within sideboards.
> - WaMT is responsible for reporting performance measures on redesign implementation to the AWMT, quarterly

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Communication and Stakeholder Involvement

Activity: Define policy development procedure – clear and inclusive.

Charge:

✓ Define a policy development procedure for the waste bureau in which steps are clearly addressed to include both internal and external stakeholders from beginning to end of process.

Sideboards:

✓ Clearly stated objectives of communication w/o bottling up the process.
✓ Clearly stated expectations for stakeholders (meet time frames, take ownership for providing input and staying involved with process, etc.)
✓ Must include intent to involve both internal and external stakeholders from start to finish of process.
✓ Utilize technology as efficiently as possible.
✓ Set up system of checks and balances to determine if working.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

✓ Workgroup
✓ Sponsor to ensure timeliness, completion and applicability to addressing issues.

Necessary steps:

✓ Gather any current procedures and review.
✓ Modify current or develop new, as applicable, to address stakeholder involvement.

Timeline:

✓ Draft prepared by April 1, 2005.
✓ Final completed and implemented by May 1, 2005.

Skillsets:

✓ Management (Section chief, regional team leader)
✓ Staff (one field based staff, one c.o. based staff)

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

- ✓ 2 managers – total of 10 hours including research/data gathering time
- ✓ 2 staff – total of 8 hours discussion and development

Dependencies- other programs, etc.:

- ✓ None.

Implementation Activity Worksheet

Theme: Information Technology

Activity: Define staffing and fiscal needs.

Charge:

➤ Provide technical and fiscal resources necessary to support existing data management needs.
➤ Plan for routine upgrades of existing systems.
➤ Position the program to both meet the data management needs of the future, and be able to adapt to future challenges and opportunities.

Sideboards:

➤ Operate within Program budget constraints.
➤ Ensure that system additions and updates will meet State and Department data management standards.
➤ Assess new technologies and applications to determine their applicability to WA Program operations and needs.
➤ Develop procedures to enhance and maintain our data systems on a regular basis.
➤ Prepare a communication/outreach plan to notify customers of new and expanded data management capabilities.
➤ Set up mechanisms to assist customers who have access or other questions about our data management systems.

How to get the job done-person or workgroup-leadership:

➤ Program Services Section develop workplans and fiscal notes for existing data management operations and necessary updates.
➤ WaMT will determine how to address the recommendations of the Redesign Team that receive the approval of the Division Administrator.

Necessary steps:

➤ Include data management in preparation of program workplan.
➤ WaMT will act on approved IT implementation plans prepared by the Redesign Team.

Timeline:

➢ See workplan and budget allocations for on-going projects.
➢ WaMT is expected to be responsible for developing timetables for approved IT implementation plans.

Skill sets:

➢ Supervisory oversight.
➢ IT technical expertise.
➢ Communication/outreach knowledge.

Resource needs (hours/FTES and $):

➢ To be developed by Program Services Section Chief and WaMT.

Dependencies- other programs, etc.

➢ To be assessed by Program Services Section Chief and WaMT..

Appendix K: Performance Measures

Five Waste Management Program Redesign Performance Measures

1.   **OUTCOME** - Improvements in timeliness, predictability and consistency of decisions.

Measures / outputs:

- Have all strategies/tools/activities implemented by July 2006.
- Track complex SW projects and HW TSD licenses, and their approval progress (existing measures systems). Meet both statutory and project mutually agreed-upon approval time-lines in 2005 and 2006.
- Survey stakeholders (external and internal) on timeliness, predictability and consistency of decisions in December of 2005 and 2006. Improve satisfaction in 2005 (2004 baseline) by 10 % and in 2006 by 20 % (baseline 2005).

Strategies / tools / activities:

- Develop guidance for identifying and dealing with precedent setting or unusual proposals for landfills by December 2005.
- Use technical experts (Engineer and Hydrogeologist) in complex SW project reviews to assure all issues are addressed and consistent statewide.
- Assign complex solid waste projects to designated personnel.
- Workload will be balanced across regional lines.
- Regional Team Supervisors will be responsible for keeping project and decisions on schedule.
- HW licensing will only be done in a maximum of 2 locations.
- WI HW administrative rules are as identical to the federal HW rules as possible, when considering WI statutory requirements, encouraging recycling, need for revenues to operate the program and the special needs of household HW by December 2006 (NRB approved).
- Provide appropriate training to staff to improve understanding of their task(s).
- Provide a mechanism for tracking individual projects and require its use.

Adjustments - WaMT will evaluate the redesign process and make appropriate adjustments to these strategies and measures in February of 2006 and 2007, based on an analysis of the measures indicated.

2.   **OUTCOME** - Improvement in collaboration and trust with HW, SW and Recycling stakeholders.

Measures / outputs:

- Administrative Rules (RUs, and SW) developed and public hearings held to allow self-certification by December 2005, final rule adopted by July 2006 and self-certification procedures and tracking available on-line by July 2006.
- Number of self-certifications issued and other projects using innovative approaches are identification and evaluated by December 2006 and 2007.
- Recycling program is restructured by December 2006 and RU consolidation results in a reduction in the number of RUs from 1060 to 950 by December 2007. Restructuring may be limited by the progress of the Governor's "Blue Ribbon Taskforce".

- WaMT will develop a program-wide decision-making method by December 2005 and all personnel will receive training in the program decision-making strategy and understand how it will be implemented within 4 months of the method being approved.
- Survey stakeholders (internal and external) on collaboration and trust in December of 2005 and 2006. Improve collaboration and trust in 2005 (2004 baseline) by 10 % and in 2006 by 20 % (baseline 2005).

Strategies / tools / activities:

- Self-certification for RUs and non-complex SW facilities, and activities.
- Develop a recycling program plan that includes restructuring the recycling program to improve efficiency of administrative program management, and improves outreach efficiency and effectiveness.
- RU outreach to promote efficiency, effectiveness and consolidation.
- Promote Green Tier, use of EMS's and other innovative approaches in SW and HW.
- Non-metallic mining audits are continued to demonstrate a level playing field.
- Reducing plan review command and control through NR 500 streamlining.
- Use the "Waste Management EMS Principles" in policy development and expanded implementation of the "EMS Principles" to include early staff input on policy development to more actively engage program staff.
- Inspection forms (HW and Landfills) are electronic by December 2005 and inspections are being posted on our web site starting July 2006.
- Develop a strategy on inspections that includes staff having laptops available to take on site to facilitate inspection documentation (forms) and provide to provide feedback to facility prior to leaving the facility by December 2005.
- WaMT develops a program-wide decision-making method that includes identifying responsibilities of individuals, teams, etc. and provides personnel training on this method.

Adjustments - WaMT will evaluate the redesign process and make appropriate adjustments to these strategies and measures in February of 2006 and 2007, based on an analysis of the measures indicated.

3.   OUTCOME - Personnel have the skills to perform assigned tasks and stay abreast of industry technology.

Measures / outputs:

- Annually, starting in July of 2005 (part of performance evaluations), each regional supervisor and section chief develops a gap analysis on the individual training needs, staff skills and disconnects.
- Number of joint industry and staff training sessions and number of staff and industry participants. Develop a baseline in 2005, and improve number of sessions and participation by 10% in 2006 and 20% in 2007.
- Survey external stakeholders to determine what technical and collaborative skills personnel need to adequately assess the operations of their facility by December 2006 and 2007.

Strategies / tools / activities:

- A&W leaders, and WA regional supervisors and section chiefs assure that needed areas of training are identified; training plans are developed, reviewed during the annual performance evaluations by July of each year. This would include using the position description in identifying the technical and collaborative skills, identifying gaps and developing a training plan to close those gaps.

- A&W leaders, and WA regional supervisors and section chiefs assure that the training plans are fully implemented, within funding constraints.
- WaMT develops a funding strategy and plan to implement the training plans by December 2005. The over all plan and individual plans are updated annually to reflect funding constraints.
- Actively partner on joint training with industry, EPA, research projects and other DNR programs, specifically focusing on SW, Recycling and HW.

Adjustments - WaMT will evaluate the redesign process and make appropriate adjustments to these strategies and measures in February of 2006 and 2007, based on an analysis of the measures indicated.

4.   OUTCOME - Shift the focus of the Waste Management Program and stakeholders from waste handling and disposal to waste materials management.

Measures / outputs:

- Number and type of "low hazard exemptions" issued in 2005 and 2006.
- Number of partnering opportunities that resulted in tangible materials being recycled/used for a higher purpose or improved producer responsibility in 2005 and 2006.
- Personnel are trained to understand the concept (waste and materials management) and how to apply it to their specific job duties by April 2007.
- Track the use of the waste and materials management document and assess the impact of the document in 2007.

Strategies / tools / activities:

- Provide support for the "Governor's Blue Ribbon Taskforce" on waste and recycling.
- Encourage landfills to develop and use gas for energy or energy production.
- Develop a document/training plan that addresses the concepts of waste and materials management that can be used in contacts with facilities, legislature and to train our staff and managers by December 2006.
- Identify priority areas and a strategy for focusing efforts to maximum environmental benefit and likelihood of success by December 2006. This focus could include producer take-back programs, product design and packaging to reduce waste, material substitutions, etc.
- Develop and implement a strategy by December 2006 that increases outreach and education by program staff to encourage beneficial use, recycling, pollution prevention and materials management.
- Development of guidance on beneficially using waste materials.
- Encourage environmentally sound beneficial use of waste materials through new guidance, granting exemptions, and other mechanisms.

Adjustments - WaMT will evaluate the redesign process and make appropriate adjustments to these strategies and measures in February of 2006 and 2007, based on an analysis of the measures indicated.

5.   OUTCOME - The Waste Management Program becomes a data-driven decision making organization and the decisions are transparent to internal and external stakeholders.

Measures / outputs:

- All existing and new guidance (sortable) is on the web by December 2005.
- GEMS, SHWIMS and plan approvals are on the web by December 2005.

- Data integration plan is completed by July 2006.
- Survey stakeholders (internal and external) on transparency of decision-making in December of 2005 and 2006. Improve transparency in decision-making in 2005 (2004 baseline) by 10 % and in 2006 by 20 % (baseline 2005).

Strategies / tools / activities:

- All plan approvals are on the Web.
- Data from systems (i.e. GEMS, SHWIMS, and plan approval tracking) are made available for public access on the web.
- Move all new and existing guidance to the web and the guidance is sortable to facilitate access.
- Data is used in all decision-making.
- Data systems are integrated and a plan is developed and implemented to facilitate this process by July 2006.
- Allow and encourage electronic submittals and use "push" technology. This includes developing a strategy and plan to accept plan submittals and licensing requests electronically by December 2006. Implement acceptance for SW and HW by December 2007.
- Policy development process and outputs are on the web. Expanded implementation of the "EMS Principles" and to include early staff input on policy development to more actively engage program staff.
- All significant administrative rule development (process and outputs) starting after July 2005 is on the web.
- Plan approvals are issued electronically by December 2005 and a data based contains the approvals and conditions by July 2006.
- Use performance measures to analyze, evaluate and make adjustments to the use of resources.

Adjustments - WaMT will evaluate the redesign process and make appropriate adjustments to these strategies and measures in February of 2006 and 2007, based on an analysis of the measures indicated.

Appendix L: Division Level Issues Needing Follow-up

Following are issues and/or recommendations that should be brought to the attention of the A&W Division Mgt. Team and possibly DLT. Part of the charge to the WMPR team was to develop recommendations that may not be applicable at this time, but may be necessary if further significant reductions (or increases) occur in future biennial budgets.

- IT at the Division Level - We do not recommend at this time, that IT resources be consolidated at the Division level by taking the positions from the individual bureaus. However, a permanent division level coordinator position is important to efficiently work with BTS and to support networking across the division IT staff and should be established. If the resources within the Division are impacted significantly through budget reductions, this recommendation should be reconsidered.

- Technical Career Ladder - The WMPR team recommends that the Division work with our HR program and OSER as needed to develop a separate technical career ladder. This would provide an advancement path for outstanding engineers, hydrogeologists, and/or specialists who do not desire to, or have the option to, move into supervisory positions. A technical career ladder will help retain our best staff in the agency through an advancement option that would allow increases in pay, higher classification, and more rewarding professional challenges.

- Combine WA and RR programs - With current funding and staffing levels, we feel that the two programs should remain separate. This allows each program to focus on their high priority work, maintain consistency, and simplify contacts for stakeholders, etc. The two programs have areas of overlap and need to continue to develop and implement procedures to enhance cooperation. If, however, significant reductions in budget and staff continue in the future, the A&W Division should review this issue and consider the option of combining the programs as a cost saving measure. This should be part of a comprehensive review of the Central Office and Regional structures including issues listed in the item below.

- Regional Program Managers report directly to the WA Bureau Director. - With current funding and staffing levels, we feel that the existing management organization in the regions should continue. Note that the "existing organization" in this case includes the reduction of four management positions included in the 05-07 Biennial Budget recently approved by the NRB. The current decentralized management allows for closer contact with stakeholders around the state, quicker response on many decisions, a step in a complaint process for Regional Management to resolve conflicts without stakeholders always having to go to the DA and/or Secretary's Office, HR issue support and actions, a Division level voice to compliment the individual program perspective, the first generalist management level in the agency to deal with integration issues, and a management level with enough program knowledge and experience to identify and support unique innovation opportunities. A direct supervisory line from the Bureau Director to the Regional WA managers could eliminate or reduce many of the functions listed above, but could enhance consistency, efficiency in program management, and save program resources by eliminating some management positions. The line reporting would have the potential to address any lingering accountability issues that are not currently being dealt with. However, there are mechanisms in the current management structure to deal with accountability issues. A brief discussion of accountability is located in the recommendation section of this report. As mentioned in the above paragraph, if the program continues to take significant reductions, the AWMT and DLT should consider changes in the Regional and Bureau Management structures, to reflect the reduced levels of staff and funding. If these changes impact other Division programs, this should be undertaken through a timely, comprehensive review under the direction of DLT.

- Coordination of WMPR implementation with the 05-07 BB reduction plan. Many questions were received regarding how we will deal with the WMPR changes occurring prior to the BB cuts going into effect. Following are some principles that the Division will follow in that regard.

- We are making changes to management structure on or about July 1, 2005, to reflect the recommendations of the approved WMPR report.
- It is expected at this point in time, we will not have to actual cut those position numbers (aka lay people off) until June 30, 2006 or 2007.
- DLT will not allow a lay-off outside the context of budget-based work force reduction plan.
- We will either announce positions or find temporary assignments in work needed for program priorities and/or redesign implementation for employees as needed during the period between the implementation of the Redesign in 2005 and the actual elimination of positions through a workforce reduction plan in 2006 or 2007.
- We will treat represented staff in a similar manner. However, we will need to work within the contract provisions on a case by case basis for any represented employees.
- The bottom line is to avoid layoffs of anyone in the program until such time as a department wide work force reduction plan is developed and implemented.